THE COMMUNIST

Vol. X NOVEMBER, 1931

...VIDENTIARY PURPOSES.
...THIS PUBLICATION MUST NOT B...
...MARKED IN ANY MANNER EXCE...
...WHERE FILE NUMBERS ARE.

FROM THE CONTENTS

What Means the Fourteenth Anniversary of the Revolution? . . . . . *Robert Minor*

Some Problems of Mass Work . . *Earl Browder*

The March of the Revolution . *William Z. Foster*

The Struggle for the Masses . . . *A. Lozovsky*

The Latest Phase of the British Crisis and Its Reverberations in the United States *Alex Bittelman*

Capitalist Theories of "Planned Economy" *Harry Gannes*

The Philosophical Discussion in the C.P.S.U. in 1930-31 . . . . . *D. S. Mirsky*

SOUTH SIDE WORKERS BOOK STORE
558 E. 63rd • Dorchester 7031 • Chicago

25 Cents

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

READ!

Develop your understanding of the problems and tasks of the working class and the developing system of Socialism in the Soviet Union through study of the current literature on the subject. Don't fail to get the following popularly priced pamphlets and books. Read them and spread them among your shopmates and friends.

On the Class Struggle in the United States

FIGHT AGAINST HUNGER ..... .05
WORK OR WAGES, *by Grace M. Burnham* ..... .10
UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF AND SOCIAL INSURANCE..... .02
SOCIAL INSURANCE, *by Grace M. Burnham* ..... .10
RACE HATRED ON TRIAL ..... .10
COMMUNIST CALL TO THE TOILING FARMERS ..... .03
LIFE IN THE U. S. ARMY, *by Walter Trumbull* ..... .10
LITTLE BROTHERS OF THE BIG LABOR FAKERS, *by William Z. Foster* ..... .05
GRAFT AND GANGSTERS, *by Harry Gannes* ..... .10
REVOLUTIONARY STRUGGLE AGAINST WAR vs. PACIFISM, *by Alex Bittelman* ..... .05

On the Soviet Union

THE DECISIVE YEAR, *by A. A. Heller* ..... .10
ANTI-SOVIET LIES AND THE FIVE YEAR PLAN, *by Max Bedacht* ..... .10
"SOVIET DUMPING" FABLE, *by M. Litvinov* ..... .02
SOVIET WAR ON RELIGION, *by M. Sherwood* ..... .10
THE SUCCESS OF THE FIVE YEAR PLAN, *by V. M. Molotov*.. .15
NEW CONDITIONS—NEW TASKS, *by I. Stalin* ..... .05
THE WAR OF INTERVENTION AGAINST THE SOVIET UNION AND THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL, *by P. R. Dietrich* ..... .10
THE NEW PHASE IN THE SOVIET UNION, *by V. M. Molotov* .15
THE SIXTEENTH PARTY CONGRESS, *by Joseph Stalin*..... .50
RED VILLAGES, *by Y. A. Yakovlev* ..... .50

Order from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS
P. O. BOX 148, STATION D NEW YORK CITY

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE COMMUNIST

A Magazine of the Theory and Practice of Marxism-Leninism

Published Monthly by the

Communist Party of the United States of America

Entered as second class matter November 2, 1927, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1890.

VOL. X NOVEMBER, 1931 No. 10

CONTENTS

WHAT MEANS THE FOURTEENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE REVOLUTION? 867
By ROBERT MINOR

SOME PROBLEMS OF MASS WORK 875
By EARL BROWDER

THE MARCH OF THE REVOLUTION 882
By WM. Z. FOSTER

THE STRUGGLE FOR THE MASSES 892
By A. LOZOVSKY

THE LATEST PHASE OF THE BRITISH CRISIS IN ITS REVERBERATIONS IN THE UNITED STATES 903
By ALEX BITTELMAN

THE WORLD CREDIT CRISIS IS GROWING 912
Leading Editorial from Pravda, September 29, 1931

CAPITALIST THEORIES OF "PLANNED ECONOMY" 917
By HARRY GANNES

THE PRESENT STRUGGLE IN CUBA 928
By O. RODRIGUEZ

THE PHILOSOPHICAL IN THE C. P. S. U. IN 1930-31 933
By D. S. MIRSKY

CULTURAL COMPULSIVES OR CALVERTON'S LATEST CARICATURE OF MARXISM 941
By A. LANDY

Make all checks, money orders, and correspondence to: THE COMMUNIST, P. O. Box 148, Station D, (50 East 13th Street), New York. Subscription rates $2.00 a year; $1.25 for six months; foreign and Canada $2.50 a year. Single copies 25 cents.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TWO NEW BOOKS!

Indispensible to every revolutionary worker

WHAT IS TO BE DONE?

By V. I. LENIN *Price 50 Cents*

Written in 1902 in the formative period of the Bolshevik Party this book still remains a basic revolutionary guide to the building of mass Communist Parties in all countries.

LABOR FACT BOOK

Prepared by Labor Research Association
Price 85 Cents

Presents in readily usable form the most important facts about American imperialism and the social, economic and political conditions facing the working class.

Order these books from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS
P. O. Box 148, Station D New York City

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What Means the Fourteenth Anniversary of the Revolution?

By ROBERT MINOR

THE fourteenth anniversary of the Russian Revolution, to be celebrated this month by the working class of all countries, comes at the end of the third year of the Five-Year Plan; and this decisive year establishes beyond question that the foundation of the Socialist system in the Soviet Union is firmly established and that one-sixth of the surface of the world with its population of 160,000,000 has entered into the period of Socialism.

Contrasting with the endless breadlines and rusting machinery and wasted farms of the capitalist world, the colossal growth of Socialism, the rapid industrialization of the Soviet Union with an increase this year of 45 per cent in production, dramatized by the building of 49 new industrial cities now going on under the superior form in the Soviet Union, the superior technical organization of cities, the conscious and socially planned building up of a working class and industrial intelligentsia, and—added to this—the abolition of the age-old forms of agriculture by the complete collectivization of agriculture on 75 per cent of all arable land under an enormously elevated social form of organization—the "peasant country" that has through revolution and collectivization advanced far toward becoming the *country without peasants*—the progressing elimination of classes resulting from its collectivization on top of the socialization of industry—this contrast stares the whole world of all classes in the face on this anniversary of the Russian Revolution.

* * *

In 1930, with the capitalist countries facing the worst depression ever known, Soviet industrial production increased by 25 per cent.

In this year, 1931, with capitalist production falling still more catastrophically, the industrial production of the U.S.S.R. will have increased by an estimated 45 per cent, which brings its level of industrial production to *three times* the pre-war level. Already, under the cruelest handicaps, Soviet industry has developed at a rate exceeding the highest rate of development ever known by any country in the palmiest days of capitalism. Its rate of development is eight to ten times the usual rate of the past best days of capitalist countries generally, and *two and one-half times* the rate of the United States in its days of most vigorous growth.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But these are not the palmiest days of United States capitalism, and today while the most savage attacks are being made against the standard of living of the working class in America, with wages of steel workers being cut as much as 30 or 40 per cent, the masses are compelled to look over their horizon of breadlines and smokeless chimneys, across the world to the U.S.S.R., where unemployment has been completely liquidated, where millions of new workers are being drawn for the first time into industry, where real wages have already been raised to approximately double the wages of before the war and are being raised steadily at an average increase of 12 per cent annually, while the wages of the steel workers of the great new mills of the Soviet Union have just been raised more than 30 per cent.

On this fourteenth anniversary the most decisive of all contradictions of capitalism in the present world is—*that it is not all capitalist!* That on the one hand stands a decaying, violently dangerous but dying capitalist system, permeated with the forces of revolution—and on the other the thriving, compact and healthy, growing Socialist system.

Let no one imagine that the depths of laboring humanity in other countries remain unchanged by this mighty transformation. Not alone by that discovery which is coming to the eyes of hundreds of millions—that they cannot longer live in the old way (the capitalist way)—is *pushing* masses away from the capitalist system; but the discovery that they *can* live in the *new way* is *pulling* tens of millions toward the proletarian and colonial revolution (provided the presence of an active, aggressive, Bolshevized Communist Party).

* * *

The shattering effect of this polarization of a world now only *partly* capitalist—is so great as almost to defy a full appreciation.

Not only the cleverest enemies of the proletarian revolution have, in the slower years of development, let slip from their memories the real historical role of the Bolshevik Revolution of October, 1917, but even among the sincere friends and the advance guard itself of the proletarian revolution there are some who fail to understand to the full extent this tremendous significance. Very few have been able to picture the possibility, in a country of extreme technical backwardness, to overtake the capitalist world, and not only that, but also how it would be possible to overcome the social backwardness of Russian village life—that endless sea of scores of millions of illiterate peasants working with methods of 2,000 years ago.

One after another, the various "Oppositions" have arisen within the Communist Party of the Soviet Union on the basis of failure to grasp these significances and these possibilities. Comrade Zino-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

viev, Trotsky and comrade Bukharin each in turn made their fights against the Leninist line of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union—and each of these oppositions in substance was built on the failure to understand that the backward village could be, as it now has been, drawn in to the great revolutionary work of Socialist construction. Of course, each drew his own conclusions from these mistakes. The right opposition was in substance a "temporary" capitulation to the bourgeois character of the upper strata of peasantry—but a capitulation which would mean death for the revolution. Comrade Bukharin who was the leader of this opposition was under the influence of a deep though not plainly expressed fear that, with the disturbance of the capitalist forms in agriculture, the Soviet state in the present level of development of productive forces would have to face a contradiction in the village which it could not solve, the productive forces of the village being developed by and dependent upon the rich kulak and the well-to-do middle peasant and these being politically against the socialization. (Of course, one should mention here also the right opposition's disbelief in the possibility of the carrying through of the Five-Year Plan, and lack of understanding of the tremendous creative powers of the proletariat and immense superiority of the socialist forms of production; this view having been overwhelmingly refuted by the assurance already established of the completion of the Five-Year Plan in its maximum form in four years).

But the real counter-revolutionary expression of this failure to understand these possibilities was that of the Trotskyites. The Trotskyites also could not see the possibility of changing the village. Their opinion was that the village would remain a permanent force of class struggle against the proletarian revolution and that this problem could be solved only by the international proletarian revolution spreading anew over a series of capitalist countries—that the Soviet Union within itself would not possess sufficient forces to guarantee the victory of the proletariat in the class struggle against the proprietor classes in the rural communities. Of course, this was in reality the problem of whether or not it is possible to build within the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics the economic foundation of Socialism.

This problem is solved in real life and struggle; this tremendous fact faces the world on the fourteenth anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution.

No wonder the bourgeois ideologists are beginning to lose their taste for toying, in a pseudo-Marixst way, with the question:

> *"Can Socialism exist in one country, surrounded by a world that remains capitalist?"*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

—and are beginning to ask themselves:

> *"Can the capitalist system continue to exist in the world where the socialist system has already been established fundamentally and a whole great nation gone into the higher system?"*

Now the problem is one of the Socialist system overtaking and surpassing, in its building of the most modern means of production on the Socialist basis, the most advanced of the capitalist countries. It is a matter of the tempo of development. But this question also has already been answered in the field of theory and by demonstration of possibilities. The tempo of technical development in the Soviet Union is bound to be greater than in the bourgeois countries. But we are presented now, not with a *development* of production in capitalist countries, but with a *decline*, which in most capitalist countries amounts to about one half!

It is not an accident that the morale of the bourgeois and especially the petty-bourgeois intelligentsia is shaken by the inexorable political logic in this situation—remembering, of course, the still colossal power of the bourgeois states, their still effective capacity to mobilize a whole world of intellectual prostitution to their service, and the bloody orgy that they are still capable of throwing the world into in defense of their hopelessly illogical system. If a Bernard Shaw speaks to the bourgeois world through a world-wide radio broadcast for a "reasonable" surrender of the bourgeois system to the Communist revolution, if a bewildered Upton Sinclair, still adhering to the party of Morris Hillquit's monarchist oil companies and Norman Thomas' social-fascism, cries out against the counter-revolutionary role of Kautsky—this is the expression of the tremendous shaking of the morale of the capitalist system before that staggering contrast of the towering success of socialism on the one hand and the decaying, death-bound but still murderous capitalist system the stench of whose decay is stifling its own ideologists. Of course, the capitalist class of the world will not change its course by one iota because the "reasonableness" of this deviation of their own ideologists, any more than the slave-owning aristocracy of the South surrendered to the perfect logic of Helper's *The Impending Crisis*, but will plunge the world into a holocaust of world war in the effort to rescue the system of slavery in which their interests are vested.

From the side of the enemies and also of stupid "friends" we often hear such ideas as:

> *"The Soviet Union is too busy with the Five-Year Plan to have any time to perform any international role."* or:
> *"The Communist Party of the Soviet Union is so busy with internal preoccupations that it ignores the international revolution."*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Of course such remarks, especially the latter, which comes so often from Trotskyites and other renegades, are an attempt to divide the inner developments in the Soviet Union from the international situation and the international role of the U.S.S.R. And such attempts are stupid when they are not deliberately criminal. Hoover—and all of the active staff of leadership of imperialism in each capitalist country—understand the truth of the fact that the development and tremendous growth of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, that the success of the Five-Year Plan, the collectivization of agriculture and the great social transformations accompanying these economic changes—constitute the greatest danger in the whole world system of capitalism including imperialist rule over the colonial and semi-colonial world which includes the greater portion of the human race.

And the fourteenth anniversary of the Russian revolution finds the impending second world war smoldering (to say the least) if not already leaping into flames of general military actions. The forces of history have vetoed the fine hopes of Chiang Kai-shek, hangman of the Chinese people, to live a comfortable life as the executioner of the Chinese workers and peasants in the pay of American Wall Street. American imperialism through the Nanking government, Japanese imperialism in the direct form of its own military forces, and Japanese and British imperialism behind the face of the Canton government, are clashing over the right to throttle China on the borders of the Soviet Union, while the Chinese masses are sure to turn in unprecedented numbers to the Chinese Red Army which already has its stronghold in parts of the country. Lenin opened the eyes of the proletariat of the world to see that half of the world's population which lives in Asia, and Asia is now a mad vortex of all of the forces that clash between the dying system of capitalism and the rising masses. The colonial and semi-colonial world, in turning against capitalism, turns perforce to the U.S.S.R.—and to the alliance with the revolutionary proletariat of the world.

The present situation in regard to Manchuria furnishes a concrete example of the extreme, urgent and real danger of imperialist war, and of imperialist war against the U.S.S.R. Japanese imperialism and the "holy hypocrite" American imperialism which likes to pose as the "anti-imperialist" rescuer of China against Japanese imperialism—both are the bloodthirsty and rapacious enemies whose rivalries are the rivalries of bandits who wish to partition and enslave China, and whose possibilities of "amicable settlement" of the issue are precisely the possibilities of an alliance of imperialist bandits not alone for slaughter and looting in China, but also for the imperialist invasion of the U.S.S.R.

The capitalist world would like to force the burden of its ruin

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and attempted salvage upon the 160,000,000 workers and peasants of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics by conquering and subjecting them again to capitalist exploitation.

The consistent and firm peace policy of the U.S.S.R. is the *only policy of peace* that is being followed by any great State in the world today; it has already several times prevented the outbreak of war; and it is followed because it is to the real interest of the working class and peasantry of the whole world to prevent the outbreak of the inevitable imperialist war as long as possible.

But let us speak plainly about the consequences of intervention against the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

> "*The intervention would be transformed, on the part of the Soviet Union, into a revolutionary war for the overthrow of capitalism, linked up with the revolutionary movements in the capitalist countries and colonies.*" (Manuilsky.)

The Communist Parties of all countries have their heaviest tasks upon their shoulders now. The Communist press some years ago printed a cartoon showing Lenin and Clemenceau in conversation: "But where will you get the troops?" asks Clemenceau. And Lenin was pictured as replying, "I will use *yours*." On this fourteenth anniversary, the Communist Parties of all countries in the world are faced as never before with the necessity of rallying the masses in struggle against the world-wide offensive of the capitalist system, both against "its own" proletarians at home and by military intervention against the fatherland of the proletariat of the world, the Soviet Union.

There is no doubt in the minds of our class enemies that the mass movement (with all of its insufficiencies) against unemployment and the militant strikes (with their insufficiencies) and beginning of independent revolutionary leadership of strikes have owed their degree of success to the work of our Communist Party. And there is no doubt that the existence of this consciously directed militancy among masses of workers has had and is having a retarding effect upon the Wall Street government led by the war-mad engineer in the White House who dreams of and concretely plans a war of conquest against the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

But although our Communist Party has won definite successes during this period, and though we can have no indulgence for the short-sighted pessimism which says "nothing has been gained, we are just where we were a year and a half ago"—nevertheless we must face with Bolshevik hardness the fact that the work and the growth of our Party and of the revolutionary unions under its leadership have not been in proportion to the enormous objective possibilities.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In his report to the XI Plenum of the Executive Committee of the Communist International, comrade Manuilsky said:

> "It is the central tactical task of the present Plenum to indicate measures for overcoming this backwardness of the Communist Parties."

Let us not forget that just as a modern capitalist manufacturer does not fail to turn the waste of his factory into a useful by-product, just so the very *ruin* of the small middle-class and white-collar elements by monopoly capitalism and its crisis—is utilized by the same capitalist system to build up the *fascist* movement for its own protection against the avenging mission of the proletarian masses. And let us remember that precisely the slowness of development of the Communist Party and the revolutionary unions—only our failure to take up with sufficient Bolshevik promptness and determination the new methods of work and to develop our *independent leadership* of the workers' struggles—*precisely* this failure on our part leaves the widest basis for the development by the bourgeoisie of its fascist mass support.

Let us not forget the sometimes overlooked task of winning those large numbers of workers who, because of our as yet insufficient work of exposure, are still subject to being used as strikebreakers by the fascist and social-fascist agencies of the bourgeoisie. This, the year of the fourteenth anniversary of the revolution, the decisive year of the Five-Year Plan, with the structure of Socialism towering above, while the morale of the capitalist system falls in bankruptcy—finds the Second International of social treason, of social fascism, in that state which Lenin was able to forecast. The trials of the criminal conspirators of the Menshevik party (section of the Second International and brother party to Mr. Thomas' Socialist party of the United States) have shown by the personal confessions of Hillquit's, Bauer's, Hilferding's and MacDonald's comrades that the "socialist" parties and their international have no objective distinguishable from that of the white guard officers of the czarist army and the general staff of the French army in its plans of bloody counter-revolutionary intervention against the U.S.S.R.

It has been truly said that although the recent congress of the "socialist" Second International at Vienna is not necessarily the "last congress" of these agents of the bourgeoisie—that nevertheless such descriptions of it indicate its deep state of bankruptcy. But like the petty merchant whose bankruptcy does not always mean a lack of ready cash resources, the bankruptcy of the social-fascists and outright fascists (A. F. of L.) agencies of the dying capitalist system among the working class—does not mean less danger to the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

working class. On the contrary. At precisely this time more than at any other time the social fascist parties and particularly the "left" arms of these agencies of the bourgeoisie are those points in the enemy's fortifications which must be most vigorously attacked. The heaviest guns of the proletariat must be directed precisely against the "left" fortifications of the social democratic gendarmerie of the bourgeoisie.

The fourteenth anniversary of the Bolshevik revolution and establishment of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is the greatest international day that has ever come to the working class and colonial peoples of the world. Let us shake off all lethargy of past routine; let us find new energy and new stimulus to grasp the new methods of work which this period demands, and under the leadership of the Communist International, take advantage of the tremendous victory that has already been won in the establishment of the foundation of Socialism—and let us carry this through to the brains and hearts of the American working class which is more receptive today in the midst of the present capitalist chaos than ever before.

MARX ON THE CLASS STRUGGLE AND THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT

As far as I am concerned, the honor does not belong to me for either having discovered the existence of classes in present society or of the struggle between the classes. Bourgeois historians a long time before me expounded the historical development of this class war and the bourgeois economists the economical structure of classes. What I did, was to prove the following: (1) That the existence of classes is connected only with certain historical struggles which are characteristic of the development of production. (2) That class war indispensably leads to the dictatorship of the proletariat. (3) That this dictatorship is only a transition to the destruction of any classes and to society without classes.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Some Problems of Mass Work

By EARL BROWDER

WITH the coming of winter and the passing of the crisis into new and deeper phases, the problems of the work of our Party among the masses become more pressing. It becomes a matter of life and death for us to hasten the tempo of solution of these problems. The resolutions and discussions of the 13th Plenum of our Central Committee furnished the basis for hastening the tempo and solving the most pressing problems of mass work. Every day new and startling events confirm the correctness of our line. But it is necessary to broaden and deepen the line of 13th Plenum in the course of its application to living work.

Our Plenum pointed out the main enemy in *opportunist lack of faith in the masses*, and the consequent growth of bureaucratic and formal methods of work, which cut us off from sympathetic contact with the masses and check the process of recruiting new members. This word of the 13th Plenum was absolutely correct and timely. Life is already showing the necessity and healthy effects of a sharp attack against these abuses. Life is also showing, however, that there may be a vulgarization of the struggle against bureaucratic methods, and a formal "bureaucratic" application even of the struggle against bureaucracy. It is necessary to be keenly on guard against this.

We have hardly begun a serious struggle against bureaucracy yet already we have seen certain examples of an interpretation of the 13th Plenum resolution as constituting a "loosening-up of Party discipline." Some comrades have even said: "How dare you try to ram down my throat a decision by a mere majority vote of a committee, in face of the 13th Plenum resolution against bureaucracy." Such comrades thought the 13th Plenum called a moratorium on decisions, and dissolved our Party into a permanent debating society. Nothing of the sort, comrades!

We shall never surrender ourselves to drowning in a sea of words! Every resolution of the 13th Plenum was designed to *strengthen Party discipline*, and to make our actions among the masses more powerful and decisive than ever before. If formalism and bureaucratic methods can isolate us from the masses, even more quickly can slackness, hesitation, interminable debate without decisions, and failure to carry out decisions with ruthless persistence. Furthermore, slackness and indecision are themselves evidence of a

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

deep-seated tendency to opportunist bureaucratic methods, differing only in form from the "drill sergeant" type of bureaucracy, but with the same political contents. We must war simultaneously against the "drill sergeant" and the slacker and interminable phrase-monger. We are a Bolshevik Party of action. We must be the steel rod that penetrates the masses, that realizes the latent power of our class.

THE PROBLEM OF FORCES

No Bolshevik can under-estimate the decisive importance of experienced leading cadres in mass work, whether it be in unemployment demonstrations, building the unemployed councils, carrying on a strike, or building the trade unions. Our trained cadres are our most powerful material weapons, without which we would be helpless. They must be the apple of our eye, we must develop them with loving care, we must constantly recruit new forces to their ranks. They are our firm reliance in the heat of struggle, without which the battle cannot be fought. They are the bearers of the Bolshevik principles to the masses, they are the eyes, the nerves, the brain, the spirit of the mass movement.

But our cadres are all these things only on one condition, namely, that they have the closest contact with the masses, draw their force and spirit from the masses, inspire the masses with their firm leadership, and draw from among the masses all the rich latent material of leadership that awaits the stirring power of Bolshevik thought and action. If, on the contrary, any part of our cadres approach the masses with contempt and sets "our leadership" over and against the natural leading capacities residing in the masses; if they see leadership only from "above"; if they rely entirely upon the thin red line of "professional revolutionists" for the multitudinous and constantly increasing tasks of leadership, then we are headed straight for break-down and disaster.

With the rising of hundreds of thousands and millions of workers for struggle, our main task as regards the problem of forces is to draw new leaders from the masses and organize them into new cadres. We must have a hundred times as many leading forces, and this is the one and only way to get them. This is a life-and-death question. It cannot wait. We must at all costs begin to do it now. And we must fight against all tendencies to hinder this process or slow it down.

Every time we face the problem of a strike or other big mass action, the cry is raised: "Give us forces!" Very good. We must give forces, without stint, for every mass struggle. But at the same time we must insistently demand an answer to the question: "How are we using the forces which we have?" If we are using waste-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fully the precious energies of our painfully limited "professional" trained forces, as a substitute for drawing forth from the masses the rich material only waiting to be used, then we are not only squandering uselessly our basic capital, without renewing it, but we are also stunting the growth of all those tender, living nerves of connection with the masses without which our revolutionary organizations cannot live. And if we are working in that way, then the cry ,"Give us forces," must be answered with the firm direction: "Change the methods of work of the present forces, first of all, and draw upon the rich forces with which we are surrounded." Cadres which cannot draw their main reinforcements from the masses, still lack one of the most basic factors of Bolshevik training, and it will not do much good to send them into the mass struggle.

ON THE ESTIMATION OF RELATION OF FORCES

In developing any mass struggle, our revolutionary cadres must work out a strategical and tactical plan of action, based upon a careful estimate of the forces ranged on each side of the struggle. The forces to be estimated are the *class* forces and their relationship. Our plans are crystallized in slogans to popularize them among the masses and serve as directives for the struggle. If our estimation of the relation of forces is incorrect, then our plans will fail and our slogans will not mobilize and organize the masses. We must *know* what is going on in the minds of the workers whom we are to lead, we must know the depth and intensity of their fighting moods, we must follow with meticulous care every thought and idea that sweeps through these masses, in order to know what are the immediate class forces on our side which we can swing into the struggle, and what kind of struggle the masses are prepared to carry through to the end. If we have well-trained cadres, with functioning organizations involving the masses, all unified and welded together by a class program of action, then we have the preconditions for a battle from which the workers will emerge stronger than before.

What our forces will be in a particular struggle, depends to a large extent upon the good work of our leading cadres, in rousing the fighting spirit of the workers and crystallizing it around fighting slogans—that is, the degree to which we mobilize the *subjective factor* of working class will to struggle. But there are also other factors, objectively given and independent of our immediate desires and actions, which set the limits within which we must operate with these subjective factors. These objective factors, and tendency of development, taken as a whole, determine the character of the historical moment and of the particular situation of each

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

partial struggle, thereby predetermining the general line and character of the immediate struggle independently of our desires. We must learn to judge these factors accurately in each struggle.

It needs little argument (and usually none) to convince our comrades in the coal-mining industry that the objective factors at present preclude any plan of armed insurrection for the overthrow of an oppressive government as the solution of their problems at this moment. We would sharply attack anyone who insisted upon such an immediate plan, not because we are in principle opposed to an armed insurrection; on the contrary, precisely because we take the question of armed insurrection very seriously as one of the historically necessary stages of the struggle, we are firmly opposed to any playing with such a slogan, or its premature raising. This phase of the problem of accurate estimation of forces is generally accepted and understood in our Party. But the less obvious examples of the same problem are not so well understood.

It is not out of place to again quote the resolution of the Eleventh Plenum of the E. C. C. I. on this question. Directing us to the necessity of finding concrete forms of the *united front from below*, as the fundamental Communist method of mass work, it said:

> "*This, simultaneously with the careful evaluation of the general situation calls for an exact estimation of the situation and the relation of forces in the various branches of industry and in each enterprise, the estimation of all the peculiar features and conditions of the various strata of the working class and the application of corresponding concrete methods of struggle: economic strikes, short protest strikes, revolutionary demonstrations, mass political strikes, etc.*"

Failure to approach the problem in this way will result (and has resulted) in the "calling" of strikes which do not materialize; or efforts to transform an economic strike into a mass political strike without establishing the necessary pre-conditions; and generally in the tendency to substitute our wishes for an examination of the actual situation as the basis of our plans and slogans.

> "Our main weakness was, and remains, lagging behind the development of the masses. But this weakness cannot be overcome by trying to jump over the tasks of the moment on the plea of "new perspectives."

THE PROBLEM OF A WEAK PARTY LEADING GIGANTIC MOVEMENTS

We are entering a period of gigantic class actions, with a Party that is still very small and comparatively weak. The contrast between our small physical forces and our exceedingly great tasks, cause some comrades to shrink back and prophecy that the "Party

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

will break down every time," unless it first builds a strong Party in the industries and districts where it must lead great struggles. This same tendency also minimizes what Party we do have now, and speaks of the Party as "non-existing" in certain places and, therefore, not worthy of consideration because of its small numbers and immature organizational form.

With such an attitude as this we will never solve our problems. This was not the approach of Lenin to the problems of the Russian Bolsheviks, when he returned to Russia from exile in April, 1917, to take up the gigantic task of organizing the victorious revolution by November. Lenin took up his task with a Party comparatively smaller than our own, in relation to the tasks facing it, but he did not moan about an "inevitable breakdown" from lack of forces. He drew his forces from the masses, and built the Party in the course of the struggle. We must follow Lenin's method. Of course our Party is not the Russian Bolshevik Party; neither have we a Lenin. It is necessary for us to build a mass Party according to the principles Lenin taught us.

The wrong attitude on this question was shown in an expression of one comrade at our 13th Plenum, in discussing the problem of building the Party in the Pittsburgh area during the miners' strike. This comrade said:

> "We had a weak Party apparatus with which to organize and lead broad united front organizations such as strike and relief committees. The result was that in the first period of the miners' strike the danger arose of the liquidation of the Party, because the leading and active comrades *had to* concentrate their *whole* power upon the formation of those strike and relief committees *without a chance* of mobilizing the *whole party apparatus* for the execution of this task."

Such a formulation of the question does not help to solve the problem. On the contrary, it accepts the *inevitability* of the non-functioning of the Party apparatus in a period of mass struggles, and theoretically justifies such a condition. Upon the basis of this formulation the conclusion has been drawn by some that "the Party will break down every time." Instead of pointing out that in such a situation "the leading and active comrades" *had to concentrate their whole power precisely on mobilizing the whole party apparatus* to carry through the mass work, and to organize the active elements from the masses to do the main part of the work for themselves, the comrade formulates a theory that it is inevitable that "the leading and active comrades" shall be leading and active only in trying to do all this work themselves with their own hands. But this is not leadership, and particularly it is not Bolshevik leadership.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The question of organization, particularly in the shops, cannot be emphasized too strongly. At the same time we must be aware of the danger of organizational fetishism, which can appear in the form of right or left opportunism. Sharper political outlook, greater political sensitiveness, will aid in the elimination of tendencies leading towards organizational opportunism. But when we speak of a sharper political perspective it must be one that has its feet on the ground and ear to the masses. We must be keenly aware of the danger of "floating in the air" and "inflated" perspectives.

In this connection it is worth while to quote the following remarks from comrade Manuilsky's report to the 11th Plenum:

> "But this Plenum must declare war on organizational opportunism just as mercilessly as the Communist Parties have frequently carried on war against political opportunism."

Our 13th Plenum spoke sharply against this tendency, and repeated and re-emphasized that portion of a previous resolution of our Political Bureau, of July 5, which said on this question:

> "The building of the Party on a mass scale necessitates that a number of misconceptions that prevail with regard to the role of the Party in general and particularly during strikes be clarified. The most important of these misconceptions are:
>
> 1. That the Party can be built only after the strike and even then only when the workers win all the demands.
>
> 2. That during the strike the members of the Party working in that strike and in the union as organizers and leaders of the strike, cannot and even must not take up simultaneously the task of building the Party.
>
> 3. That during the strike the individual leading members of the Party are entirely exempt from working within the Party (nuclei, district committees, etc.)
>
> 4. The limitation of the functioning of the Party organizations during the strike to the point of liquidation of the regular functioning of the nuclei, district committees, etc.
>
> 5. That the Party must work only through fractions and not come forward as an independent force among the masses of the strikers, and at the same time failure to organize even the fractions.
>
> The above tendencies, expressed sometimes openly but more frequently by a failure to carry out the tasks on the plea of other pressing matters, are in practice a denial of the leading role of the Party, and if adhered to would make impossible not only the building of the Party but the conduct of the strike successfully as well. The role of the Party is particularly important at the present stage of the development of the crisis of the capitalist system with the increasing role of terror and social demagogy."

We must constantly refer back to our Plenum resolutions, such as this, and refresh the minds of our comrades on our most au-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thoritative decisions. The experiences of the struggle now going on provide us with the most precious lessons for future struggles. We must not, and we shall not, continue to repeat all our old mistakes in every new struggle. It is the task of our Party to insure that these lessons are well-learned, even though the process should be protracted and painful.

ALL OUR PROBLEMS ARE PROBLEMS OF MASS WORK

All the problems of the Party, organizational as well as political, are in reality problems of mass work. And these problems must be solved in life, in the consciousness and actions of all the Party members, and, through them, the non-Party masses.

There is not yet enough participation of the Party membership as a whole in the political solution of our problems. We still too much leave these problems only in the higher committees. It is quite true that it is the special duty of the Central Committee and its Political Bureau to lead the Party in the solution of all problems. But we must not allow that the solutions are merely handed down, ready made and pre-digested, with nothing remaining to be done by the member except to read and accept.

It is the duty of each and every member of the Party to study our problems and our resolutions, and make contributions to their decision. Above all, it is the duty of each member, through the regular Party channels, to check up on the execution of the Party tasks and policies, to see that they are not distorted in practice or neglected and forgotten. Every Party unit and committee from the bottom up should be seething with life and political discussion around precisely such problems as these.

We are now in a period when a small Party must arouse and lead million masses in a struggle for life, and in the process build itself into a powerful Party of the masses, capable of smashing the capitalist system and setting up a workers' government. Our Party cannot measure up to these tasks without taking every question with deadly seriousness, and hammering out the correct Leninist line with precision and ruthlessness.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The March of the Revolution

By WM. Z. FOSTER

THE present world situation is one that should hearten and stimulate every revolutionary worker to intensified struggle. Ceaselessly events are shaping up for the downfall of capitalism and the world victory of Socialism. Capitalism grows weaker and its foundations decay; the world revolutionary movement becomes stronger and the basis for Socialism extends. Irresistably the center of gravity in the world relation of class forces moves away from capitalism and towards the proletarian revolution.

Born and bred under capitalism as we have been, and with a consequent tendency to ascribe to present-day institutions a semblance of permanency which they in reality do not possess, we are much inclined to underestimate the speed of the development of the capitalist crisis and the world revolutionary movement. The whole situation is a brilliant justification of the analysis and policy of the Communist International.

A DECAYING CAPITALISM

Today world capitalism is in difficult and rapidly worsening position. The present economic crisis, the most devastating in the history of capitalism, is adding enormously to the already existing difficulties arising out of its steadily developing general crisis. The economic crisis, already two years old, grows constantly more acute and menacing. "The mode of production," as Engels says, has indeed risen "in rebellion against the form of distribution." World industry and agriculture are prostrate and no relief is in sight. The crisis has increased the unemployment, wage cuts, mass starvation and pauperization, both in imperialist and colonial countries, to an altogether unheard-of degree. The precarious post-war capitalist stabilization has been fundamentally shattered.

The economic crisis has also rapidly hastened the development of the already acute war danger. Never were the capitalist international antagonisms so sharp; never were the armaments so huge and deadly; never was the menace of a world conflagration so imminent. The whole capitalist world presents a scene of ever-sharpening imperialist struggle over markets, natural resources, and political hegemony. The great capitalist powers are in a dog-eat-dog struggle with each other, seizing and enslaving the weaker countries and organizing against the Soviet Union. Capitalism,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

driven on faster than ever by its basic economic contradictions, rushes headlong to a war incomparably the most terrible and devastating in human history. Capitalism is not only rapidly forcing huge million masses into actual starvation but is also a vast murder machine preparing to drive the human race to the shambles.

As the general crisis of capitalism develops so fast under the stress of the present economic crisis symptoms of demoralization begin to appear among the bourgeoisie. Their beloved system of exploitation is breaking down. They see this, and they are alarmed, confused, and at a loss as to how to prevent it. Thus W. P. Simms, Scripps-Howard Foreign Editor, expresses this fear and confusion in an article on Oct. 5. Referring to the many recent international conferences, he says:

> "The object of these epochal goings and comings, it is admitted behind the scenes, is nothing less than to prevent, not merely the collapse of this or that particular country but of the white man's universe as a whole. For recent events have driven Washington, London, Paris, Berlin, and Rome to the startling realization that only some sane accord on international finances, economics and armaments—and that promptly—can prevent a general smash."

The capitalists see one after another of their schemes and panaceas fail to check or cure the enveloping, destructive crisis. They are just beginning to realize what Marxians knew long ago, that they do not understand their own economic and political system, and a deadly fear is developing among them that it has most serious if not fatal flaws.

The economic smash has dealt a mortal blow to the American theory of mass production and "high" wages which, only two years ago, was hailed all over the capitalist world as the cure for the recurrent cyclical economic crises. This whole conception has exploded with a loud report, to the special consternation of the pride-inflated American bourgeoisie. Mussolini was even unkind enough to say that the cause of the present economic crisis was exactly American mass production methods.

All the capitalist attempts to stem the crisis by regulating production and bolstering up sagging prices have fallen dismally, both in the United States and internationally. Among such ill-fated schemes were the Hoover conferences of two years ago to liquidate the crisis by a building boom, the wheat and cotton fiascoes of the Federal Farm Board, the many plans to "stabilize" the mining industry, "Alfalfa Bill's" comic opera regulation of production by troops, the British and Brazilian adventures in rubber and coffee price fiixing, the defunct European steel cartel, Chadbourne's sugar scheme, etc. The recent "World Congress for Social-Economic

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Planning," held in Amsterdam, displayed utter capitalist confusion and adjourned without developing a program.

Nor has fascism the glamorous appeal it once had as a solution of the capitalist crisis. It is true that world capitalism, in its efforts to throw the burden of the crisis upon the workers, develops inexorably everywhere in the direction of fascism and fascist methods of terrorism; but, with Italy, this classical land of fascism, as deep in the mud as the other capitalist countries are in the mire, it is hard even for capitalists to believe that Mussolini has found the solution for the basic economic problems of capitalism.

The capitalists see little light in the social fascist program of organized capitalism and super-imperialism. They see in the Socialist program just what it is—not an economic panacea for capitalism and not a rival economic system—but a weapon at their disposal to use against the workers to force them down to lower standards and more intense capitalist exploitation under the guise that all this is necessary for the sometime transformation of capitalism into Socialism.

To add to the capitalists' confusion and alarm comes the amazing and meteoric rise of the Soviet Union. They see its industries flourish inexplicably, while their own decay just as inexplicably. They sense that they have to do with a new and higher social order. They begin to develop an inferiority complex towards the Soviet Union. They talk confusedly about applying "its useful lessons for capitalism." They babble futilely about adopting its principle of planned production, and of developing capitalist five-year plans. And a paralyzing fear clutches at their hearts at the thought of the revolutionizing effect being produced upon their starving toilers by the great successes of the Russian workers in building Socialism. At the World Congress for Social-Economic Planning, Pollock, a German scientist, declared:

> "The Soviet Union has filled millions of workers and peasants with hope and belief in a better future and of the possibility of further progress. With us, on the contrary, things get worse every year. If capitalism is not capable of arousing equal enthusiasm and readiness for sacrifices in the masses, then there can be no doubt that they will finally choose the path of the Soviets."

Pessimism and confusion tends to spread among the bourgeoisie. Their old-time confidence in the God-given destiny of capitalism shakes a bit. With growing concern they begin to see clearly shaping up the world struggle of the forces of Communism against those of capitalism. They see the menacing threat to their class rule, and they are uncertain if and how they can defeat it. Their old-time economic and political soothsayers have failed them, the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

relentless progress of the crisis having made ridiculous their optimistic plans and predictions. They call for dictators and political Messiahs to solve their overwhelming problems. They put forth one scheme after another to liquidate the crisis. Thus we are treated to a whole series of "Swope plans," "Woll plans," "Hoover plans," etc., etc. Even the Illinois fundamentalist preacher who seeks to solve the crisis by all-night prayer meetings has about as much of a following as many of the discredited captalist economists.

Meanwhile, the capitalists follow a practical course of action which sharpens every contradiction of capitalism. All plans to cure the crisis failing, and hoping at least that it will eventually liquidate itself in the time-honored manner, they take steps which inevitably deepen the whole crisis. They carry out wholesale wage cuts, unheard of speed up, starvation of the unemployed, expropriation of the poor farmers, tariff wars and international financial banditry, organized credit inflation, ruthless domestic and foreign competition, intense rationalization of industry, etc., all of which tend to sharpen the contradiction between the capitalist modes of production and distribution and therefore intensify the crisis as a whole. And to complete their destructive program, which stands as a bar to the further progress of the human race, the capitalists are preparing more rapidly than ever an attempt to solve the insoluble contradictions of capitalism by a resort to arms and mass slaughter.

THE GROWING REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT

Although capitalism thus rots at the heart it will not fall of its own weight. It must be overthrown by the revolutionary working class. This Marx and Lenin have clearly taught us. The developing general crisis of capitalism prepares a favorable objective situation for the revolution. But no matter how difficult the situation may become the capitalists will find some way to continue capitalism, let the cost be what it may, in mass starvation and war, until the workers develop sufficient clarity of program and organization to give it its death blow. The positive measure of the progress of the revolution is the extent to which the workers and poor peasants are developing revolutionary organization and struggle.

Even a glance at the world situation must show a rapid growth of the revolutionary movement. A deep radicalization of the workers, a strong revolutionary upsurge, spreads among the toilers of factory and field everywhere. Faced with actual starvation, increasingly disillusioned with capitalism, and more and more inspired by the Soviet Union, these masses enter into struggle against capitalsm in ever-increasing numbers and with constantly more determination and revolutionary clarity. It is only in the sense of a develop-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing world-wide movement against the capitalist system itself that we can understand the vast revolutionary upheavals in China, Indo-China, and India; it is what lies at the base, if not so developed, of the "revolutions" in Latin America. It alone can explain the great wave of strikes and revolutionary political movements now developing in Europe.

Of course, to a very large degree, this expanding and deepening mass struggle against capitalism is still unorganized and confused in program. In the industrial countries the social fascists, both rights and "lefts," and even the open fascists, are able, by the use of radical demagogy, to put themselves at the head of large masses of discontented workers, poor farmers, and city petty bourgeoisie and thus to break up or demoralize their struggle against the capitalists. In the colonial lands, likewise, the demagogic Gandhis still exert a great sway and serve to shield the native capitalists and world imperialists from the sharpening attacks of the exploited masses.

But the iron logic of the class struggle is swiftly and relentlessly exposing these tricky capitalist agents. The unmasking of MacDonald, the gradual crumbling of the German Social Democratic party, the going over of many fascist workers and leaders in Germany to the Communist Party, the growth of the Communist Party in India, the establishment of Soviets in China, etc., etc., are all typical of the general world trend towards the revolutionary clarification and organization of the struggle against capitalism. The Communist Parties gradually intrench themselves in every country. More and more definitely the Communist International becomes the actual leader of the world's oppressed and of their struggles against the oppressors. Clearer and clearer, out of the welter of local issues, grows the basic world issue of Communism versus capitalism.

But, of course, it is above all in the Soviet Union that the revolution acquires its greatest strength and stature. There the toilers are making a stormy and ever-more rapid advance, highly demoralizing to the whole world capitalist system. The brilliant success of the Five-Year Plan throws consternation into the capitalist world and inspires the workers of every country to new militancy and struggle. While industry in all capitalist countres is paralyzed, industry in the Soviet Union is developing at a pace totally unequalled in the whole history of industry. While capitalist agriculture is in a crisis which brings mass starvation to hundreds of millions, Russian agriculture, through collectives and state farms, proceeds upon the highest stage in the world, bringing prosperity, culture, and happiness to the great masses. While 35,000,000 starving workers walk the streets of capitalist cities unemployed, every worker in the Soviet Union has work. While wage rates and living standards of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

workers drop catastrophically all over the capitalist world, wage levels constantly rise in the Soviet Union.

Small wonder then that the capitalists everywhere are alarmed and begin to show signs of demoralization. For them the world scene is full of evil portents and dire forebodings, with their own ruinous and uncontrollable economic crisis, the rapid radicalization of the worker and peasant masses, the growth of the Communist movement and the beginnings of disintegration of the socialist parties, and, to fill their cup of worry to overflowing, the spectacular advance of the Soviet Union. Small wonder also that this same picture of world capitalist decay and revolutionary growth is an inspiration to the workers of the world for renewed battle against the rotting capitalist system.

THE REVOLUTIONARY PERSPECTIVE

The capitalist system, as Marx and Lenin have taught us, is not of uniform strength in all its parts. Because of its uneven development in the various countries it is as a chain of stronger and weaker links. Thus the revolution advances, not by breaking the chain simultaneously in all its links, but by beginning the break at the weakest links. Old Russia was such a weak link and the Russian revolution such a break. Already the tension upon the whole world capitalist chain is great and it rapidly becomes greater. So far has the capitalist decay proceeded that the possibility of the rebellious toiling masses causing a new serious revolutionary break in the capitalist chain becomes more imminent and it may occur at any time. This perspective of threatening breaks of the weaker capitalist links has been outlined at the recent plenums of the Comintern Executive.

That world capitalism is under a constantly increasing strain and that it gets into real danger of a revolutionary break in its chain is exemplified, not only by the broad developments of crisis and revolutionary struggle indicated above, but also by many significant signs of the past few months. Among the more important of these have been the Spanish revolution, the mutiny in the Chilean navy, the intense German financial crisis, bringing about the moratorium on war debts and a frantic effort of international capitalism to save Germany from Bolshevism, the fascist putsch in Austria, the growing financial crisis in the United States, with the huge government deficit, hundreds of bank failures, and Hoover plan of credit inflation, and finally, the British financial crisis, with the down-fall of the Labor government, the naval mutiny, the hunger riots, and the abolition of the gold standard in Great Britain and other countries.

These great shocks are not the natural accompaniment of return-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing capitalist health, but definite signs of capitalist disintegration and decay. They are not the end of the movement but only its beginnings. They are the advance tremors of still greater economic and political earthquakes that are brewing.

Already the strain upon several of the capitalist weaker links becomes dangerously great. In first line there is the critical situation in Germany. Here the revolution grows manifestly nearer. Various factors combine for the rapid development of a revolutionary political crisis; the industries are paralyzed and the financial crisis becomes ever deeper, huge masses of workers and poor farmers are starving, the bankrupt Social-Democratic party is gradually disintegrating, the capitalist class turns more openly to fascism. Then, what is decisively important, the Communist Party is growing by leaps and bounds. The class struggle sharpens on every front. The German working class is gradually drawing together its forces for a revolutionary attempt to free itself from the intolerable slavery of capitalism.

A proletarian revolution in Germany would be a deadly blow to the whole system of world capitalism. It would in all probability draw with it Poland (already in deep crisis) and other countries on the Russian border. Thus, with the U. S. S. R., would be created a gigantic and undefeatable Soviet bloc. This great Soviet Union, supported by increasing movements of the workers in the capitalist countries, would certainly be in a dominant position on a world scale as against the decadent capitalist system. The center of gravity in the world relation of class forces would be definitely on the side of the revolution.

Thus profound would be the effects of a successful proletarian revolution in Germany. Yet, so acute has the German situation become that such a revolution may well be a matter of the near future. The fear of this devastating smash in Germany is a living one in the minds of capitalist governments everywhere and is an enormous stimulus to their war plans against the Soviet Union. Prof. J. T. Thayer, in October *Current History*, describes the temporary easing of the German financial crisis as a six months' reprieve from world bankruptcy.

Capitalism is threatened with serious disaster not only from the advancing German revolution, but also from the deepening war danger. Considering the increasing radicalization of the toiling masses, the establishment of the Communist Parties in the various countries, and the expanding power of the Soviet Union, another great war, directed against the Soviet Union or amongst the imperialist powers themselves, would almost certainly provoke revolutionary upheavals fatal to big sections of capitalism. A new world war could very likely result in a Soviet Europe.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Despite this danger, which many capitalist writers see, the imperialist countries press on with their mad rivalries and struggles. With increasing armaments and belligerency, they make the question of war so sharp that any spark may start a terrible conflagration. Never was the war tension so great. Innumerable proofs have been given that the various peace conferences, Kellogg pacts, League of Nations activities, etc., are no protection against war, but are only so many pacifistic frauds behind which the imperialists advance their war plans. The Manchurian situation again vividly exemplifies the acute war danger. It might readily become the starting point for a general conflict for a great war that would result fatally to European capitalism.

Can the capitalists cure the general crisis and decay of their system? Can they turn back the forward march of the revolution? Can they even secure a temporary respite from the present crushing economic crisis by a revival of industry? As for the last question, the answer to it is problematical. If there are no serious breaks in the capitalist chain in the meantime it is probable that, at least in the stronger countries, capitalist economy will round out into the next cycle, emerging from the present low stage of production to higher levels of industrial activity. But that this upward turn will come soon or extend far is doubtful. Already whole sections of capitalist economy are in more or less chronic depression and crisis, and the tendency is decidedly for this condition to spread. The great colonial markets of China, India, etc., are in chaos. Many of the industrial countries, including England, Germany, Poland, etc., defeated in one manner or another in the struggle for markets, have had an almost unbroken industrial depression for years. Also agriculture, coal mining, textiles, and several other industries are suffering from chronic overproduction the world over, including the United States. Any recovery, therefore, that may be registered from the present world economic crisis can only be very partial and temporary in character. It would be bound to be soon followed by a crash more far-reaching and devastating even than the present one.

As for the first question—can the capitalists cure the growing general crisis of capitalism?—this we must answer decisively in the negative. Capitalism cannot be stabilized. The basic contradiction between the capitalist methods of production and of distribution—the tendency for the productive forces to expand and the markets to contract—relentlessly undermines the whole capitalist system of the private ownership of industry and exploitation of the toiling masses. All the capitalist schemes of debt moratoriums, credit inflation, wage cutting, attempts to regulate production, etc., will fail dismally to bridge over this fundamental contradiction. It causes

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ever-more devastating economic crises with wholesale impoverishment and radicalization and revolutionary organization of the *masses;* it produces ever-sharpening rivalry between the imperialist countries and results in the menacing danger of war. Inexorably the general crisis of capitalism develops and its tempo becomes faster and faster. The whole social process goes relentlessly towards the overthrow of the obsolete capitalist system and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. As the Communist International has so often declared, this is indeed the period of the revolutionary transition from capitalism to socialism.

WHAT WE MUST DO

Shall we, from all this, assume a fatalistic attitude and conclude that capitalism is doomed and will fall regardless of what we may do? Of course not. It is our great task to build the Communist Party and the revolutionary mass organizations and to bring the workers into ever greater collision with capitalism. Without such work on our part there can be no revolution. The sharpening of the world crisis of capitalism, therefore, must not be a signal to us to relax in our revolutionary efforts but to enormously extend and intensify them.

Nor can we base our activities upon merely promulgating revolutionary slogans and enthusiastic contemplation of the approaching revolution. The very basis of our whole fight must be the everyday grievances of the workers. We must be the leaders in the fight for unemployment insurance and relief, against wage cuts, for the rights of Negroes and foreign-born workers, etc.

Only in such day-to-day struggle and work in the shops and among the poor farmers can we build our organizations and secure mass leadership. And only by the systematic politicalization of such battles can we teach the masses of toilers the real meaning of the class struggle and mobilize them for greater political tasks; the building of the Communist Party, the defense of the Soviet Union, the final overthrow of the capitalist system.

The present situation presents a wonderful opportunity for us to build our Party, the T.U.U.L. unions, and all the other revolutionary organizations. The masses are rapidly ripening for our leadership. But we must not assume that mechanically they must come to us for leadership, that because our general program is correct, we are automatic heirs to mass leadership. Such leadership we can win only in the open struggle. It is true that the social fascist traditions and organizations are weaker in the United States than, for example, in Great Britain and Germany. This is an advantage we have over other countries, and we must make the most of it.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But we must not be led into underestimating the danger of social fascism. We already see that the Amercian bourgeoisie is trying to remedy its "historical error" by insidiously strengthening the social fascists on every possible occasion. We must be very vigilant and energetic to prevent the social fascists from intrenching themselves among the masses. Especially must we be on our guard against the "left" phrase-mongers of the Muste type who, in this period of the rapid radicalization of the workers, will spring up in many places to demoralize the workers and to prevent the advance of our Party. All the resources we have, especially the youth, must be skillfully mobilized and developed to meet adequately this highly favorable situation.

Our Party has gigantic tasks in this, the leading country of capitalist imperialism, in the organization and education of the great masses. But with the assistance of the Communist International, it will prove equal to these tasks. Already, in the recent big movements of the unemployed, of the Negroes, and in the various strikes, our Party has proved, despite many weaknesses, its growing ability to lead the struggling workers. Our Party is now taking its first steps towards becoming a mass Communist Party. And our recent Central Committee Plenum, with its great stress upon shop work and the everyday struggle and immediate demands of the workers, clearly outlines the road we must follow to go on with the Party's revolutionary development.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Struggle for the Masses

By A. LOZOVSKY

THE fundamental task with which the R. I. L. U. was confronted from its very foundation has always been the struggle for the majority of the working class, the struggle for those workers who are under the influence of international reformism, of the Right and Left opportunism; the struggle for the leadership of the masses, to turn the working class into a "class for itself," his fundamental strategical task in different periods and different countries was solved in different ways.

It is dependent upon the situation, upon the correlation of forces between the working class and the bourgeoisie, and upon the correlation of forces within the working class itself. But it was the need to conduct activities among the workers, however reactionary the organizations to which these workers belong, that stood out sharply in all the stages of the struggle, that was always considered irrefutably true.

This principle was particularly stressed at the Fifth Congress of the R.I.L.U., at that same congress which determined the conditions in which it is not only possible, but even essential, to commence organizing new unions, and which summed up the results of the ten years of activity of the Red International of Labor Unions.

Is it possible to state that this fundamental line taken by the R.I.L.U. eleven years ago has been systematically applied? Can we say that all is as it should be in this respect, and that the decisions of all the congresses of the R.I.L.U., stressed by the Fifth Congress, have found sufficient practical application in the everyday activities of the R.I.L.U. supporters? By no means can we say this. On the contrary, we must admit quite openly that there are a number of serious and dangerous shortcomings and weaknesses in this respect, which we must combat determinedly and ruthlessly.

GERMANY

Let us take Germany as a start. A number of very great successes in the organization of the revolutionary trade union movement can be noticed during the past year—the R.T.U.O. is beginning to become an organization that must be taken into consideration, although numerically it grows at a slower rate than it might. The revolutionary trade union opposition is becoming a serious fac-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tor in the everyday struggle of the working class; it is able to register in its favor several strikes, the formation of a number of new trade unions, and several important successes in the factory committee elections. All these successes, however, are only relative —the present state of the R.T.U.O. by no means is in conformity with the requirements presented to the revolutionary trade union opposition by the growing mass movement. There is a manifest lagging behind all along the line.

What is the cause for this lagging behind? First and foremost, it is to be explained by the fact that during the past year activities in the reformist trade unions have greatly slackened. When the Fifth Congress of the R.I.L.U. decided to withdraw for Germany the slogan of "Join the Reformist Trade Unions" and decided on the organizational crystallization of the revolutionary trade union movement, it stressed particularly that this implied not only the continuance but even the intensification of activities in the reformist trade unions.

There are certain successes in developing the revolutionary trade union movement, in developing the R.T.U.O. and independent trade unions, but none the less simultaneously we must also admit the loss of a number of important positions inside the reformist trade unions, which assists the counter-revolutionary maneuvers of the trade union bureaucracy.

ACTIVITIES SLACKENED

Proof is hardly needed to show that our activities in the reactionary unions of Germany have slackened all along the line. What is the reason of this? Surely the supporters of the R.I.L.U. in Germany know that there are about six million workers in the reactionary unions in their country? Surely they realize that to refuse to conduct activities among these millions of workers implies putting off the immediate struggle for power? What is the matter?

What has happened is that it has become more difficult to conduct work inside the reformist unions, because the reactionary trade union bureaucrats take all measures, inclusive of expulsions, to get rid of "restless souls." The obstacles have increased, but our forces have also increased. If this is the case, then it cannot be given as the reason for slackened activities all along the line. There is another, a more serious cause: the metaphysical manner of placing the question, widespread among part of the functionaries of the R.T.U.O., *either we form independent unions of else conduct activities in the reformist unions, one of the two.* Such a method of putting the question is incorrect and profoundly dangerous.

It is incorrect because it breaks our line into two and opposes

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the development of the independent trade union movement to the tactic of winning hundreds of thousands and millions of workers to strengthen and further develop this same independent revolutionary trade union movement.

"OURS ARE RETTER . . ."

When we speak of an independent revolutionary trade union movement we thereby not only determine the attitude of our organizations to the reformist unions, but have in mind most of all the *mass character* of the movement. The independent trade union movement is good only to the extent that it possesses a mass character. In order to make it a mass movement we must lead the millions of workers inside the reactionary trade unions. Anyone who opposes the one to the other is hopelessly confusing the question and simply adds fuel to the fire of the reactionary trade union bureaucrats.

Let us consider. Can a mass revolutionary trade union movement be created in Germany without winning the workers from the influence of the reactionary trade union bureaucracy? No, this is impossible. This is realized by each and every supporter of the R.I.L.U., but while realizing it they do not draw the necessary deductions. The tendencies which exist on this question may be described appropriately as follows:

"Sooner or later the members of the reformist unions will come to us. We will carry on general agitation and propaganda and we will see that our new unions are better than the old ones, and then they will come to us."

MINERS AND METAL WORKERS

All this would be very well if it were correct. Actually our new unions can only stand on their legs in the process of the struggle, and in order to conduct the struggle successfully the participation of the members of the reformist unions in the strike struggle is essential. Otherwise all these strikes must end in defeat.

Take the metal workers' unions in Berlin as an instance. The reformist union has 40,000 to 50,000 members, our union has 20,000. Needless to state, we must develop furious activities to unite the unorganized metal workers, who constitute the majority in the Berlin-Brandenburg district, but if we are not going to pay any attention to those 40,000 metal workers belonging to the reformist unions, if we are not going to fight for every worker, if we are not going to fight furiously for each factory, then the black-leg reformist apparatus, which still has considerable masses

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of workers behind it, will possess sufficient forces to smash any movement.

The same must be said about the miners' union of the Ruhr. At present we have in this union also about 20,000 members; the reformists have twice as many members. There is a large Catholic union in the Ruhr, and to refuse to work in this union will simply be playing into the hands of the reformists.

INDEPENDENT UNIONS

At the present time there are in Germany several independent unions (metal workers, miners, builders, agricultural laborers, seamen and dockers, etc., etc.). All these unions unite a total of about 75,000 to 80,000 workers. If we add up how many workers are united under reformist and Catholic leadership in these same industries we see that they have more than a million workers. Can we think seriously of turning our unions into mass organizations, of making them the determining factor in the class struggle, as long as millions of workers in these industries are outside of our organization, and a part of them even outside of our influence?

Many comrades may say that "we never said anything against working in the reformist unions, it is sufficient even for the R.I.L.U. supporters to speak for it; what we need is that they work stubbornly, systematically, and leave metaphysics alone: Either an independent trade union movement or work in the reformist unions."

There is another form of argument. The workers engaged in the independent unions argue roughly as follows: "We who are at the head of the independent unions should work only in these unions, while the others—the Party, the R.T.U.O.—should carry on work inside the reactionary unions."

WE MUST DIVIDE THE FORCES

This is incorrect. Such arguments are just as dangerous, profoundly dangerous. Why? Because thereby we withdraw from ourselves the responsibility for work among the workers in our industry. If we were to take such a stand in Berlin or the Ruhr, for instance, it would mean that our unions in the Berlin metal factories would be isolated from the others; they would also conduct activities among the unorganized, but would take care to keep a good distance between themselves and the members of the reformist unions, every one of whom influence several unorganized workers.

The workers who belong to the reformist unions are to be found in the factories; in the factories they carry out the line of the reformist unions, which have in them their apparatus, their rep-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

resentation, while it is our task to drive the reformists out of all the positions they occupy, to wrest the workers and the factories from the reformists.

Because of this we must not divide the workers into two categories; we will conduct work among one category (the unorganized) and let others—the R.T.U.O. and the Party—carry on work among the other category (members of the reformist unions).

There is still another objection made: "It is impossible to carry on activities in the reformist unions in the fashion we would like. There is no trade union democracy; the slightest attempt to oppose our policy to the reformist policy meets with expulsions. Seeing that we have to remain in the reformist unions, isn't it better to follow a policy which would safeguard us from expulsions?"

Such arguments of a Right-wing opportunist character are also still to be met with among supporters of the R.I.L.U. When we speak of the need to carry on activities in the reformist unions this does not mean that we recommend adaptation to reformism, recommend remaining in the reformist unions and thinking of self-preservation only.

DRIVE OUT THE REFORMISTS

This would not be revolutionary work in the reformist unions, but the most infamous adaptation to the demands of the reformist apparatus and repudiation of the elementary duties of revolutionaries.

Carrying on activities in the reformist unions implies overcoming absolutely all difficulties, fighting for every single worker, driving the reformists out of the positions occupied by them, winning from the reformists those workers who still follow them, wresting from the reformists the rank-and-file trade union positions, rousing the indignation and fury of the working masses against the reformist trade union apparatus and its officials, who are corrupt right through.

Do we see such activities conducted in the reactionary unions in Germany? Hardly. We do not see them, not because we are situated at a great distance, but because practically no such work is carried.

Unfortunately, Germany is no exception. Whether we look to England, Czecho-Slovakia, France or the United States, everywhere the same thing is to be observed.

WAITING FOR THE MASSES

In Czecho-Slovakia there are 70,000 members of the Red unions, and about a million members in the reactionary unions. At the last parliamentary elections 700,000 votes were cast for the Communist Party, of which number at least 100,000 were votes cast by work-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ers belonging to the reactionary trade unions. Why did these workers remain in these unions; why did they not join our unions?

Because we oppose one field of work to another. "We have independent Red unions," argue some comrades, "and the rest will come of itself. When the workers become disappointed, when they see that the reformists are scabs and frauds, they will come to us and become active members of our organizations."

Sooner or later, of course, the workers will come to us. But is it our task to wait with folded arms till this happens? This, however, is precisely the line followed by the R.I.L.U. supporters in many countries when matters touch upon the reactionary unions.

In France and the United States we have our own revolutionary unions, but, not to speak of the fact that recently there has been a big drop in membership in our unions, the R.I.L.U. supporters lose sight entirely of the fact that there are hundreds of thousands of workers in the reformist unions whom we can and should win.

INCORRECT LINE IN STRIKES

While we carry on no work at all inside the reformist unions in France the reformist agents of the Independence Committee are carrying on quite vigorous work in our ranks. In other words, the reformists are taking advantage of the tactic presented by us to weaken our ranks, and we let the reformist trade union bureaucracy alone, although the objective conditions are favorable to the extreme for us in spreading revolutionary ideas among the workers, including the members of the reformist unions, and mastering the tactics of the revolutionary trade union movement.

This incorrect line is seen in all strikes. Thus during the miners' strike in France we failed to win the majority despite the tremendous unrest among the miners. A strike is now being waged in France of 120,000 textile workers, and the leadership is in the hands of the reformists. All this is the result of the metaphysical manner of placing the question: "Independent unions or else activities in the reformist unions."

We observe the same picture in the United States. Our unions not only do not grow, but, under the blows of the employers, the police and our own mistakes, have lost part of their membership. Side by side with our small unions there are some relatively mass unions, affiliated to the American Federation of Labor. Well, do we conduct activities in these unions, do we organize groups in them, form contacts? No, despite all the dozens of decisions, this practical work is not being carried on.

DIFFICULTIES?

Why? The most popular argument is: because the American trade union bureaucracy forthwith expelled from the unions anybody

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

who comes out in defense of the class line. But if the trade union bureaucracy expels us, does this mean to say that our work must be stopped? The expulsion of R.I.L.U. supporters just proves that our work is dangerous for them, for it undermines their influence. Instead of insistently maintaining the line laid down we see serious vacillations and slackened work all along the front.

Even in those countries where there are no independent revolutionary unions with the exception of one or two, as in Britain, we likewise observe weakened activity in the reactionary unions. When attempts are made to find out what is wrong, what has caused this slackening, nothing but the word "difficulties" is to be heard. It is more difficult to fight capitalism than to fight the trade union bureaucracy, but we do not turn down the task put us because of its difficulty.

In view of this the objection as to the difficulties won't stand water. To refuse to overcome difficulties is following the line of least resistance, is opportunism pure and simple, and has nothing in common with the revolutionary tactic of the R.I.L.U.

EVERY-DAY DEMANDS

Work inside the reformist and other reactionary unions requires from us not words but deeds. In some cases this work is interpreted to mean the publication of leaflets and non-periodical journals from time to time, speeches, and demands presented under all conditions which exceed three, four and fivefold the demands presented by the reformists.

Why should we carry on work in the reformist unions? To win the workers to our side. To do this each worker must see for himself that we are better than the reformists, that we really defend his every-day demands, that we formulate them; that we are well-read in price lists agreements, that we can find our way about in labor legislation, that we are fighting for what at the given time is troubling each worker.

In a word, the worker must see in us not simply good revolutionaries who tell them in words the way out of the crisis, but also good revolutionary trade unionists, revolutionaries who, in business-like fashion and militantly, solve the problems which at the given time engage the attention of the workers, and in order to get a reply to which they appeal to their unions and trade union delegates or the Social-Democrats.

The question of the content of our work inside the reformist unions is the basic question. Frequently it is held that our work inside the reformist unions is chiefly to expose them. Of course it is a most important task to expose the scabbing of the reformists, but the crux

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the matter is how to expose them. They can be exposed anyhow, "generally," and they can be exposed on the basis of concrete facts applying particularly to the given plant and the given industry.

OPPORTUNIST POLICY

If we are simply going to expose and don't do anything to prove by action that we can carry on trade union work better than the reformists, and organize the every-day defense of the workers' interests, direct strikes better than the reformists, however eloquent we be, our eloquence will never open for us the doors to the broad masses.

Revolutionary tactic by no means requires that such economic demands be presented as may seem unachievable to the workers. To be a revolutionary does not mean to call for a strike every day and to lead the strike which has been commenced to the grave—all this is simply a deviation from the revolutionary line and a distortion of revolutionary tactics. Revolutionariness is displayed not in the number of demands and not in the shouts for strikes, but in the methods of getting the demands which have been presented carried out.

It is easy enough, as is frequently done, to present the slogan: "Down with the 5 per cent Wage Cut, and Long Live the Proletarian Dictatorship." Of course, an advanced worker understands the connection between these two slogans, but we draw up the slogans not only for the advanced workers, but for the basic masses of the men and women workers.

The task is to lead the workers to understand the connection between wage cuts and the struggle for the proletarian dictatorship. This can be done, not by mechanically linking up these demands, but by using the strike further and further, learning from the lessons of the strike itself in the process of the struggle, and by explaining to the workers the connection between their elementary demands and the struggle of the working class against the entire capitalist system.

VERY LITTLE DONE

When we stress the need for work in the reactionary unions the various shades of opportunists begin to shout: "We told you so; we told you what would happen," etc. But if we take a glance at what these gentlemen say we will see how correct is the saying that it is not always when two people say the same thing that they mean the same.

What did the Rights say? They proposed that we force the trade union bureaucrats to fight; they proposed that we pursue such a line

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the trade unions as would give the reformists no grounds for expelling us; they proposed that we reject independent leadership in the economic struggle and let it all alone for the reformist trade union apparatus; they proposed and propose—and this is the entire meaning of the new trade union program of the Brandlerites, absolutely illiterate and stinking with opportunism—to confine all our work to the limits of trade union legalism, to submit to the trade union statutes, trade union discipline, and behave ourselves approximately in the same way as the "Labor" Party in Britain behaves towards the monarchy, *i. e.*, be the opposition to their majesties, the black-leg trade union bureaucracy.

Needless to say, we cannot accept this Liberal policy, for this is a policy of subjecting the interests of the working class to the interests of the bourgeoisie. What is there in common between this rotten opportunist policy and our line of *untiringly extending and deepening work inside the reformist unions to strengthen the independent revolutionary trade union movement?*

Nothing at all, and therefore our comrades should not be confused at the cries of the opportunists, who all the time clutch at us, making it appear that they take part in the revolutionary working class struggle.

The struggle for the masses is incompatible with a mechanical or metaphysical conception; it requires pliancy, the ability to orientate in each given moment, and an understanding of the fact that the struggle for our class is far from being ended, that we must go to those places where the workers are to be found, whether it is a reformist, a Catholic or a fascist union, whether it is a sports organization or any other.

We must conduct our activities where the workers are to be found, from day to day undermining the bureaucratic trade union apparatus, undermining the influence of the Social-Democracy, disintegrating and smashing the entire system of deceit and suppression of the workers' initiative, the entire policy and tactics of international reformism, which subjects the interests of the working class to the interests of the international bourgeoisie.

This is why we should now check up what has been done in this sphere since the V Congress. We know what has been done to strengthen and develop the revolutionary trade union movement, but we do not know what has been done to extend activities in the reformist unions, or, rather, we know that very little has been done.

V CONGRESS DECISIONS

Those who desire, not in words, but in deeds, to win the majority of the working class, who desire to conduct a successful struggle

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for the masses, must comprehend the following extract of the decisions of the V Congress of the R.I.L.U.:

> "A stubborn, plodding struggle is required from the R.I.L.U. adherents in the *reactionary unions*, particularly in the reformist unions (and likewise the Catholic and fascist unions, where they are really mass organizations), in order to win the workers of these organizations to the class struggle and to transfer them, in compact groups, to the corresponding Red trade unions, or in order to strengthen the revolutionary trade union opposition.
>
> "A most determined struggle must be waged against any interpretation of this most important work in the spirit of trade union legalism. Work assumes particularly great importance in those organizations where there are no parallel general revolutionary trade centers, as in Britain, Germany, Austria, Sweden, Norway, and likewise in the countries where the revolutionary trade unions are illegal.
>
> "For this purpose the *tactic of the united front from below* must be pursued on a widespread scale as a means of penetrating into the very thick of the working class, breaking down all barriers separating the workers belonging to the reformist unions from the R.I.L.U. supporters, and as a reliable means to overcome the stiffness, stability and tendency for the membership of the Red trade unions and supporters of the revolutionary trade union opposition to decrease."

UNITED CLASS FRONT

Thus the Congress of the R.I.L.U. not only emphasized the need for conducting activities in the reactionary unions, but also pointed *how* and *why* this should be done. Of particular importance in this respect is the application of the tactic of the united front, for without a united front, not in words, but in deeds, activities in the reformist unions will be fruitless.

How could it be otherwise? In so far as we work in the unions to win over to our side the working masses the question as to the methods of work assumes particularly great importance. The foundation of foundations should be the tactic of the united front from below, the tactic of unity in the struggle against the class enemy. The tactic of the united front is all right if this united front is established on the basis of a concrete program of demands. The united front is of use and importance if it is anti-capitalist. Any other united front is anti-labor, and this means that the R.I.L.U. supporters must determinedly fight it.

INTENSIFIED ACTIVITIES NECESSARY

The reformist trade unions at the present time form the chief prop of the tottering and fluctuating capitalist system. We would be committing a tremendous mistake if in hoping for the rapid de-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

velopment of the revolutionary process we were to refuse to intensify activities in the reformist unions. There are some comrades who think approximately as follows: "*As* the workers are rapidly being revolutionized activities in the reactionary unions become superfluous."

Such argumentations are incorrect. Precisely *because* the working masses are becoming revolutionized we should intensify our activities in the reactionary unions, as now is the time most suitable to win the masses from their reactionary leaders. If we don't do this the reformist trade unions, in the days of the decisive struggle, may draw with them considerable masses and thus smash the movement.

We must disintegrate the reactionary trade union apparatus by actions *from without* and *from within*. We have already learned, with defects and falterings, how to do it from without, but as regards doing it from within matters are in a terribly bad state. The sooner we effect a determined improvement in this sphere the sooner we succeed in disintegrating the reactionary trade union apparatus, the sooner will we strengthen the revolutionary trade union movement and lead the masses to the struggle for power.

EXTRACT FROM "COLLAPSE OF THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL" BY LENIN

All oppressing classes of every description need two social functions to safeguard their domination: the function of a hangman, and the function of a priest. The hangman is to quell the protest and the rebellion of the oppressed, the priest is to paint before them a perspective of mitigated sufferings and sacrifice under the same class rule (which it is particularly easy to do without guaranteeing the "possibility of their realization"...). Thereby he reconciles them to class domination, weans them away from revolutionary actions, undermines their revolutionary spirit, destroys their revolutionary determination. Kautsky has turned Marxism into the most hideous and bigoted counter-revolutionary theory, into the most filthy clerical mush.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Latest Phase of the British Crisis and Its Reverberations In the United States

By ALEX BITTELMAN

THE fall of the British pound throws a glaring light upon the depth and acuteness of the crisis not alone of capitalism in England but of capitalism as a world system. It presents in a most dramatic manner the extension of the *financial crisis*, which made its first appearance in Germany and Central Europe generally and also in Central America, to the rest of the capitalist world. It takes place on the eve of the 14th Anniversary of the Soviet Power which is completing the laying of the foundation of a Socialist economy.

The developing financial crisis constitutes a new phase of the world economic crisis which is taking place in the basis of the general crisis of world capitalism. It struck first the weakest links in the world capitalist system, the countries of Central and Southeastern Europe, the most outstanding of which is Germany, and also the countries of Latin America. It then drew in its maelstrom English capitalism followed by the Scandinavian countries. This, in turn, is greatly accelerated by the further development and extension of the financial crisis to other parts of the capitalist world.

Also in the United States we can already see the first danger signals—a credit and monetary strain—of the present new phase of the world economic crisis. The uneven development of the financial crisis is only intensifying the disproportions and contradictions of the decaying world capitalist system.

The immediate result of the sharpening world economic crisis, in its present new phase, is a fresh onslaught of the capitalist class upon the standard of living of the working class and the exploited farmers countered by ever widening struggles of the masses for the revolutionary way out of the crisis. The sharpening of imperialist rivalries, especially between British and United States imperialism, has received a fresh impetus. Above all, we witness the growing acuteness of contradiction between the capitalist and Socialist worlds, the widening contrast between the consolidating Socialist system of the Soviet Union and the decaying capitalist system, with the resulting ever increasing danger of military intervention.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The analysis of the Eleventh Plenum of the E. C. C. I., showing that capitalist stabilization is coming to an end, is receiving full and complete confirmation. The historic dates for the conclusion of this last phase of capitalist stabilization are becoming shortened.

THE FALL OF THE POUND AND OF THE "LABOR" GOVERNMENT

The present financial crisis in England is deeply rooted in the general conditions of the decline of British imperialism. Unlike the other big capitalist powers, such as, the United States, France and Germany, British production and foreign trade have never risen to the pre-war level. British capitalism did not have even a temporary prosperity. The present world economic crisis came to England on top of a prolonged and deep depression.

British production and foreign trade, in the post-war period, were on the downward grade, falling to levels below pre-war. Taking 1924, which was already below pre-war, as 100, production by 1930 had fallen to 98.5, and by the first quarter of 1931 to 84.8; exports had fallen to 88.7 in 1930, to 69.1 in the first quarter of 1931, and to 65.8 in the second quarter of this year.

The parasitic and decaying characteristics of British imperialism were obvious already before the war. These found their expression, among other things, in the unfavorable balance of trade, in the "increasing dependence on tribute to make a balance" (R. Palme Dutt, *Inprecor*, 44). These characteristics of British capitalism became highly accentuated in the post-war period as a result of the general crisis of world capitalism, the sharpening contradictions of its uneven development, etc.

But the margin of this tribute from foreign investments and colonial exploitation, which enabled British capitalism to balance its trade and make new foreign investments, has been continually narrowing down. The next credit balance, that is, the sum available for foreign investments, stood at roughly 690 million dollars in 1929; it fell to 150 million dollars in 1930 and was steadily disappearing during 1931. These are the conditions that have brought about the fall of the pound and the abandonment of the gold standard by English capitalism.

It was especially the beginning of the financial crisis in Germany (and Central Europe) that gave the pound its last blow. This, together with the offensive upon the British gold reserves by the French and partly United States capitalism, were the immediate causes for the "collapse of London as the world money market" (*Ibid.*). English banks had about 500 million dollars locked up in the "frozen" credits in Germany, a sum that was way beyond what the financial structure of English capitalism could carry. On top of this came the heavy withdrawals of French and also United

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

States credits from London as part of the offensive upon British imperialism by its rivals in connection with the Hoover moratorium. This hastened the coming of the English financial crisis which is rooted in the general decline of British capitalism highly intensified by the deepening world economic crisis.

To meet the approaching collapse of British imperialism, the ruling class of England has been pursuing the policy of ruthlessly attacking the standard of living of the English working class and of the colonial peoples. The role of the Labor party and its government consisted precisely in this that it carried through this attack of the English ruling class upon the masses at the same time demoralizing and breaking the efforts of the working class and the colonial peoples to develop a counter-attack. Under the leadership of the Labor party and its government, the English capitalists carried through a wide campaign of wage cutting in all industries. Between January and June of this year, according to the Ministry of Labor *Gazette*, over two million workers have suffered wage-cuts reducing their earnings by more than one million dollars per week. In July alone 614,000 workers had their wages cut by 415,000 dollars a week. This gives only a partial picture of the actual wage cutting that took place in the last six months under the guidance of the Labor government.

This, however, did not prevent the outbreak of the financial crisis. Anticipating this event, and under the pressure of the conflicting interests within the ruling class, a certain regrouping of forces began to take place in British imperialism. The "National" government took the place of the Labor government, with the Labor party going into "opposition." British capitalism, through its National government under MacDonald, is putting into life a new onslaught upon the working class, cutting the unemployment "dole," further reducing wages, etc. Although the proclaimed purpose of the new government in initiating this onslaught upon the workers was to "save the pound and the gold standard," both were abandoned by the National government shortly after it asssumed power. Henderson and the Labor party are playing the role of "opposition" in order to save the Economy Plan of the national government from being wrecked by the revolutionary struggles of the masses under the leadership of the Communist Party.

The radicalization of the masses is proceeding at an accelerated pace. Tens of thousands of workers, all over England, demonstrate in the streets against the national government and its "Economy Program," engaging in militant encounters with the police which is trying to disperse the demonstrations. The unemployed in London invade the "sacred" precincts of the parliamentary grounds voicing their protest against the cut in the "dole." The

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rank and file workers of the trade unions and of the Labor party demonstrate bitter resentment against the leaders that betrayed them, beginning to recall what the Communist Party had foreseen and foretold.

With this as a background we can understand the full significance of the strike of the sailors in the British Atlantic fleet against the announced cut in their wages. The apparent deliberation and calm with which the spokesmen of British imperialism had undertaken to break the strike in the navy is only a mask to cover up the panic which had seized them in the face of the first signs of revolt in the main fortress of British imperialism. The virtual mutiny in this most important section of the British fleet, challenging in effect the capitalist way out of the crisis in its present phase, signalizes the approach of epoch-making revolutionary battles against British capitalism.

Under these conditions the Communist Party of Great Britain, and the Minority movement (the revolutionary trade union opposition), are confronted with great tasks and responsibilities. The main task is stated in the Open Letter of the Political Bureau of the Communist Party of Great Britain as "the creation of the broadest possible united front for mass struggle against the government" to combat its attacks upon the "dole," the workers' wages and the general standard of the toiling masses. This means that the Communist Party and the Minority movement undertake to place themselves at the head of the masses to lead their struggle against the capitalist offensive and for the revolutionary way out of the crisis. The key to the unfolding of these revolutionary battles lies in the *independent leadership* of the daily struggles of the workers by the Communist Party and Minority movement.

This requires the most ruthless and persistent struggle against the Labor party. This is stated very clearly in the Open Letter of the British Political Bureau which says: "There can be no fight against the government without a ruthless struggle against the Opposition." It is the Labor party that has laid the basis for the national government and for its "Economy Program."

At the Trade Union Congress in Bristol, Arthur Henderson, the present leader of the Labor party and of the "opposition," was forced to make several confessions. Among these are: 1) "his approval in principle of a national government, while objecting to the manner in which the present government was formed"; 2) "that the late Laborite cabinet by a majority had agreed to a 10 per cent reduction in the dole, the break-up not coming until later." (*New York Times*, September 11.)

The Labor party thus stands condemned, out of the mouth of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Henderson himself, as differing not one whit from the national government. By the same token the Labor party and Henderson stand revealed as fakers and swindlers whose pretended opposition to the government and its "Economy Program" is only a maneuver to prevent the masses from fighting against this program under revolutionary leadership.

To expose this maneuver and to win the masses away from the Labor party and from its right and "left" leaders is one of the most important tasks of our sister Party. Especially dangerous and harmful are the "lefts" of the Independent Labor party (Maxton and Co.) who, under the hypocritical slogans of "unity," are trying to save the Labor party so that it can continue to fulfill its role of saving British capitalism in this crucial hour of its existence. The main fire must, therefore, be directed against these "lefts," whole role is to cover up with "left" phrases the treachery of the right. There can be no fight against the national government without a ruthless struggle against the Labor party; and there can be no fight against the Labor party without a ruthless exposure of and struggle against the "lefts" of the Labor party (Maxton and Co.).

The Socialist party of the United States is banking upon the ability of the "left" Laborites to save the Labor party in order to save British capitalism. The *New Leader* undertakes to whitewash the Labor party by telling an outright lie, namely, that "we find the Labor government out of office because it could not sanction a reduction in unemployment insurance." Henderson in Bristol "confessed" that the Labor government had agreed to a 10 per cent cut in the dole. Then the *New Leader* takes courage in what it hopes to be the fact that the resignation of the Labor government will strengthen the Labor party and will help it win its damaged prestige among the workers. The "left" phrases of the "left" Laborites are expected to play the most important role in accomplishing this end so dearly desired by the supporters of imperialism all over the world.

By striking at the Labor party and its present leaders, but especially the "lefts," the revolutionary movement of England will strike the most effective blow at British capitalism at the present time.

THE NEW CAPITALIST OFFENSIVE IN THE UNITED STATES

The collapse of the English pound, and the events subsequent to it, were received by the ruling class of the United States with mixed feelings of satisfaction and worry. On the one hand, the pleasing perspective for Morgan and Co., of the dollar taking more fully the place of the pound and of Wall Street stepping into the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

places vacated by London. On the other hand, the rather disagreeable perspective of the further deepening of the world economic crisis as a result of the further extension of the financial crisis. The latter perspective must have been more predominant in the mind of Morgan because it moved him to break "his almost iron-clad rule against talking for publication" and to speak for publication to a correspondent of the *New York Times*, giving him views on the collapse of the pound, etc.

The dollar versus the pound, and Wall Street versus the City as the money center of the world, is already showing itself in various parts of the capitalist world. Especially is this to be seen in Latin America where the rivalries between British and United States imperialism are particularly acute, Argentina and Brazil having switched off from the pound to the dollar. The Pacific Coast-European Conference has decided to replace the pound with the dollar "for future rate basis calculations on shipments of certain commodities from Pacific coast ports to Europe." (AP dispatch, Sept. 25.)

According to the *New York Times* Washington correspondent (Sept. 28), it is the opinion of the Washington administration that "the void in world leadership left by the straits of the British empire must be filled in part by the United States." Monopoly capital in the United States is actively pushing forward in this direction of "world leadership," that is, more intensified imperialist aggression and exploitation.

Hand in hand with the above come the "negative" characteristics of the financial crisis in Britain. According to the Washington correspondent of the *World-Telegram*, it is the opinion of government officials that "the export trade of the United States, which has declined steadily for the past year, may suffer as a result of Great Britain's abandonment of the gold standard," that "in countries where the United States and Great Britain compete for markets, Great Britain will have a distinct price advantage because of the change in value of the pound sterling and the ability of manufacturers to sell more cheaply." (Sept. 28.) The current issue of the *Guarantee Survey*, published by the Guaranty Trust Company of New York, inclines to the same point of view when it says that "a lower market value of the pound sterling in terms of foreign currencies should tend to stimulate British exports" and that it will be possible "for British producers to sell goods abroad more profitably than it has been heretofore." The abandonment of the gold standard by British capitalism, essentially a defensive measure to save itself from collapse, has in it, nevertheless, elements of offensive on the field of world trade directed especially against the United States capitalist class.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Another "negative" characteristic of the financial crisis in Britain is the possibility of its spreading also into the United States. Already we observe a heavy outflow of gold from the United States (270 million dollars from Sept. 24 to October 3) and a distinct stiffening of money rates. This latter is especially noteworthy because of its symptomatic character. The Federal Reserve Bank of New York, in its current monthly review, finds that "large offerings of bankers' acceptances to dealers in connection with these movement of funds, together with some apprehension as to possible effects on money conditions of continued gold exoprts and earmarkings, resulted in advance in market rates on acceptances by three-eights of one percent.... There was a corresponding upward movement in the yields on short term government securities, and time money was slightly firmer." It concludes by saying that "the anticipation of a tendency toward firmer rates was also reflected in the bond market, where government bonds as well as others showed reactionary tendencies." This is not yet the beginning of a financial crisis, but these are tendencies going in that direction.*

The answer of the capitalist class of the United States to the deepening world economic crisis, and to its newest phase (the financial crisis and the fall of the pound with all its consequences) has been a new powerful onslaught upon the American workers and a quickening tempo of imperialist aggression. The wage slash of October 1, in steel, rubber, aluminum, motors, on some railroads and other basic industries, affecting millions of workers; the intensified maneuvers against unemployment relief and insurance; the invitation of the French premier Laval to the United States as a means of pressing forward the fight of Yankee imperialism

* Since the above lines were written, the credit and currency "strain" has become much more pronounced showing a further extension of the financial crisis. Hoover's "new" plan to establish a 500 million dollar corporation to discount virtually worthless paper of bankrupt capitalist institutions will not check the deepening of the crisis. It does, however, open the door to inflation which is another method of robbing the workers and poor masses generally, another avenue of attack upon the standard of living of the exploited classes. The resort to this new corporation, with Hoover's promise to revive the War Finance Corporation, also proves that the Federal Reserve Board System, which was created to deal with precisely such situations as the present, cannot fulfill its tasks. It offers another proof of the bankruptcy of "organized" capitalism, the darling of Social-Democracy and Right Wing opportunism. In addition to opening a new road of attack upon the standard of living of the masses, Hoover's new plan marks a further integration of monopoly capital with the government, a further fascization of the methods of rule of United States capitalism. Immeasurably increased tempo for the execution of the XIII Plenum decisions of the Central Committee must be our answer to the deeping crisis and the widening and quickening attack of the capitalist class.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for hegemony in Europe and of consolidating the anti-Soviet front for military intervention under the leadership of American imperialism; fresh moves to raise the tariff walls; the campaign to give more "freedom" to the trusts and monopolistic corporations together with a further development of fascist tendencies which underlies all of the programs to "plan" capitalist economy; threats to establish an open fascist dictatorship to deal with the "emergencies" of the present situation (Detroit Convention of the American Legion); various moves for the further enslavement of the peoples of Latin America—these are the means with which American capitalism undertakes to "solve" the problems raised by the crisis in its newest phase.

The leaders of the American Federation of Labor, and the Socialist party, are doing in the present situation all that is expected of them by their imperialist masters. In his Labor Day address at Ottumwa, Iowa, William Green renews his allegiance to fight against unemployment insurance by saying that the "American workers abhor the imposition of a dole regardless of any guise under which it may be bestowed," urging the further extension of the capitalist stagger system. Matthew Woll, also in a Labor Day address delivered in Detroit, "urges the abolition of the anti-trust laws" and the "need of better and greater organization of industry." Norman Thomas (*New Leader*, Sept. 26) finds progress in the "Swope Plan," whose main shortcoming (according to the leader of the Socialist party) is that "his plan is by no means a sound approach to socialism."

At the same time the social-fascists are developing the most refined demagogy among the workers. They, who have enabled the capitalists to enforce the wage cutting all through the crisis, are pretending to be against the wage cuts, even "threatening" strikes. Undoubtedly Green & Co. will undertake to "head" strike movements in order to prevent the revolutionary unions of the T.U.U.L. from assuming leadership and in order to betray the workers at the most crucial moment of the struggle. In the carrying out of this strategy, the capitalists and the leaders of the A. F. of L. will continue to make use of the "left" social-fascists especially on the most advanced sectors of the revolutionary front. Muste & Co. will be doing the job, as they are doing it now, under the cover of their "left" phrases and with the support of the renegades from Communism—the Lovestone and Cannon groups.

In the light of these new developments, the extension of the financial crisis to Great Britain and its repercussions in the United States, the decisions of the 13th Plenum of our Party assume deeper meaning and importance. Face to the shop, struggle against bureaucracy and formalism, raising the initiative and self-activity

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the Party membership and of the workers—these are the roads through which our Party will be able to bring leadership and organization to the workers who must fight and are ready to fight against the intensified offensive of the capitalist class.

The present answer of the American capitalist class to the problems raised by the development of the financial crisis does not in principle differ from the previous capitalist "solution" of the crisis. The principle is the same. It is the principle of shifting the burden of the crisis to the workers, the exploited farmers, the Negroes, etc., to the oppressed colonial peoples, and to the Soviet Union, on the one hand, and to the imperialist rivals of American capitalism, on the other hand. But the concrete measures proposed by the ruling class of the United States to achieve a capitalist way out of the crisis at the expense of the working class are now being applied *on a wider front with a progressively greater use of both fascist demagogy and fascist methods of repression.* The same redoubled force of attack, masked by various pacifist maneuvers, the capitalist class of the United States is employing in its efforts to consolidate an anti-Soviet intervention front, to strengthen its hold upon Latin America, and to establish its own hegemony against its imperialist rivals. The danger of intervention in the Soviet Union, in the face of the seizure of parts of Manchuria by Japanese imperialism, is obviously much closer and menacing than heretofore.

This means that, while our immediate tasks remain the same (these have been stated clearly by the 13th Plenum of the Party), *the tempo of our work must be increased manifold.* At the present moment the tempo is decisive. Opportunist passivity, especially the one that puts the blame for its own failure to make faster progress upon the "backwardness" of the American working class, is the greatest obstacle in our path which is to be combatted as the chief right danger. At the same time we must continue to combat the other expression of opportunist passivity—the "left" variety—which fails to tackle with the necessary determination the Party's immediate tasks because other and bigger tasks are looming before us in the perspective.

The 13th Plenum of the Central Committee has formulated for the Party its immediate tasks and program of work. These decisions we must now carry into life with increasing and ever increasing tempo.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The World Credit Crisis Is Growing

Leading Editorial from Pravda, September 29, 1931

"IF the world credit crisis which has broken out because of the crash of the pound," writes Hilferding in the evening edition of the *Forwarts*, "will not be prevented it will bring about undescribable political and social consequences."

Such is the conclusion of the acknowledged "saviour" of international capital from the existing situation.

He is appealing to the financial capital of France and the United States to save the international capitalists. The proletarian revolutionary is appealing to the international solidarity of the proletariat—Hilferding is appealing to the international solidarity of the capitalists. The proletarian revolutionist is calling for the overthrow of capitalism. Hilferding and his followers are calling for the salvation of capitalism. The proletarian revolutionists are organizing the workers and under the guidance of the proletariat—also the toiling masses for the struggle against imperialism. The heroes of the II International are attempting to create a united front of the international bourgeoisie in order to save capitalism.

However, not only is there any "organized capitalism" but all of the attempts to organize the international bourgeoisie for the struggle with the crisis are falling through.

Snowden in his speech in the House of Commons in connection with the abolishment of the gold standard has complained in dramatic tones that France and the United States have answered with refusal to the request of the British Parliament to grant a new loan for the salvation of the English credit and currency system and that the proposal of the English government to call an international conference for the redistribution of the gold accumulations was refused by the United States and France who have at their disposal these gold accumulations.

The French Minister of Finance, Landin, in the session of the League of Nations has openly ridiculed the proposals in regard to the granting of new loans and the French Premier Laval, before his departure to Berlin has openly stated that the French gold bag will be tied even more securely. The press of the United States does not conceal that the dollar could not hasten to the assistance

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the pound because "the condition of the money market in the United States does not permit of this."

The two best specialists of the II International—Hilferding and Snowden—have vainly attempted to save the main base of the world credit and currency system—the pound. But the pound is rolling down and it drags with it into the precipice of the crisis, the entire complicated and delicate mechanism of the international credit system.

Following England, Sweden and Norway have abolished the gold standard.

The direction of the influence of the English financial catastrophe upon the international capitalist economy is already becoming clear in its basic traits.

The depreciation of the pound has rendered a blow to the most important emission banks of the entire world. The monetary units of the different capitalist countries have been secured not only by gold but also by the foreign currencies, especially the pound, which was considered equal in value to the gold. The French bank guards in its safes the British currency to the sum of 1.8 billion gold roubles. In the safes of the Federal Bank of the United States, in Holland, in Belgium, in Switzerland, Sweden, Austria, Germany, not speaking of the British dominions and colonies, enormous sums are stuck in pound currency. The currency and monetary system in the African colonies of British imperialism, in Hongkong, in the Malay States, are resting upon the stability of the pound. The depreciation of the pound has at one blow disorganized the entire monetary system of the greatest colony of British imperialism—India. The rupee has begun to roll downward together with the pound.

The credit crisis has led already to the inflation of credit to the rise of discount rates in a number of countries. Undoubtedly, England, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Germany, Austria, Hungary, Jugo Slavia, India, etc., will be followed by other countries. The rise of the discount rates is an expression of the sharpening of the struggle for gold for free money capital. The increase in the cost of credit is worsening the condition of industry, commerce, transport. It is hastening mass bankruptcies.

England has been the main banker financing the international foreign trade. Despite the diminishing role of London, the world trade is as yet financed 60 per cent by London. Likewise the international financing of the merchant marine and of the insurance business has been in the hands of the London City. The English "Acceptance Houses" (banks giving credits on commodities, re-discounting collateral) and banks have dominated these fields. New York has just begun the struggle for the ousting of English capital from these fields. Paris was making only the first timid preparatory

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

steps. And were we to judge by the response of the international bourgeois press to the crash of the pound, it is becoming apparent that the bourgeois economists do not even have a conception how to replace England in these fields. The normal course of financing foreign trade, merchant marine, insurance business has been shattered. The credit crisis which broke out has led to a situation where each of the capitalist countries is withdrawing its short time credits from other countries, is attempting to mobilize its long-term investments, is throwing back its foreign stocks, state obligations, is ceasing or reducing to a minimum the export of capital. Attempting to save itself, each capitalist country is recalling its capital which is at present in other countries. Enormous amounts of capital are being transformed into treasures. The "normal" circulation of capital upon the world money market which was even undermined previously by the burdens of the reparations and international war loans, shaken through the "freezing" of milliards of credits in Germany, Austria, Hungary and the countries of South America, has now been completely disorganized.

At the same time on the inner monetary markets of a number of most important capitalist countries a panicky withdrawing of the deposits from banks and savings accounts is on the increase. Likewise, there is taking place "flight" of the paper money and the hoarding of gold "in the sock," as well as the "flight" from the State obligations (bonds) which are depreciating to the material values. On the inner market of the most important capitalist countries the "normal" functioning of the capitalist credit is being undermined.

England is occupying a peculiar position on the world market. England is the largest buyer of food because it has practically no agriculture of its own. United States, Germany, France are in a much better condition in this respect. England is the largest consumer of raw materials. With the exception of coal, England imports all kinds of industrial raw materials and during the recent years even iron.

England is the largest consumer; wheat is being imported from Canada, Australia, Argentine, United States; butter and dairy products from New Zealand, Australia, Denmark, Finland; iron ore from Sweden, Spain Belgium; wine from Portugal, Spain, France; bacon and meat from Argentine, Denmark, Australia, United States. Luxury items are being supplied by France; cotton by United States, Egypt and India; coffee by Brazil and other South American countries, etc.

The depreciation of the pound signifies that the role of England as a buyer of the agricultural products, raw materials and finished products will diminish even without the introduction of the tariff.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And the introduction of the tariff in England will create even greater difficulties for the imports into England. The world market already contracted by the crisis will contract still further.

The depreciation of the pound will lead inevitably to the sharp reduction of the real wages of the workers, to the actual decrease of the expense of social legislation. The English industrialists are filled with hopes that the lowering of the cost through the inflation will increase the competitive ability of the English commodities on the world market. This condition is arousing the anxiety of the bourgeoisie of other countries. Italy has already raised its duties 15 per cent and Germany is already alarmed by the increase of English export; there is a panic in France because the depreciation of the pound will sharpen the English competition at a time when Germany is using desperate efforts to force its export. France itself has adopted a number of measures against the German exports. In Switzerland extraordinary measures are pending. The struggle for markets is sharpening, the tariff walls are growing.

"Normal" circulation of commodities on the world market is being more and more impeded. The disorganization of the world market is increasing, the struggle between the largest imperialist countries is deepening.

These are the basic factors which determine the influence of the crash of the English pound upon world economy. It goes without saying that this event together with the mutiny in the British war fleet will have tremendous consequences also inside the British empire. The relation between England and the Dominions is being changed in its foundation. The colonies and semi-colonies of British imperialism are experiencing all of the negative consequences of the British crisis in tenfold dimensions. In India the indignation and protest are already growing against the robbing of the country by means of the depreciation of the rupee in favor of the British imperialism.

English imperialism has been oppressing and exploiting its colonies, relying among other things upon its military power and its financial and economic strength. The pound and the military fleet—two mainstays of the British power—are undermined. Industry is decaying.

In England itself British imperialism at the cost of the colonial super-profits has been bribing through crumbs certain stratas of the working class—the labor aristocracy. Opportunism, social imperialism have grown in England upon this soil. The MacDonalds, Hendersons, Maxtons are the ideologists of this opportunism, social imperialism nourished by the crumbs from the colonial super-profits. Now the social base of British imperialism is being undermined.

The mutiny in the fleet, demonstrations in London, Dundee, Liv-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

erpool, Glasgow, the stubbornness of workers in partial strikes, the rapid growth in the activity of the masses mark a new phase in the development of the labor movement in England. The class struggle between the English bourgeoisie and the proletariat, the national liberation struggle in the colonies against the British imperialism, are rising to the highest level.

Before our eyes the deadly crisis of the largest imperialist country is unfolding, the world credit crisis is growing. This is the best evidence of the general crisis of the capitalist system.

LENIN ON THE CHARACTERISTICS OF A REVOLUTIONARY SITUATION

For a Marxist there is no doubt that a revolution is impossible without a revolutionary situation; furthermore, we know that not every revolutionary situation leads to revolution. What are, generally speaking, the characteristics of a revolutionary situation? We can hardly be mistaken when we indicate the following three outstanding signs: (1) it is impossible for the ruling classes to maintain their power unchanged; there is a crisis "higher up," taking one form or another; there is a crisis in the policy of the ruling class; as a result, there appears a crack through which the dissatisfaction and the revolt of the oppressed classes burst forth. If a revolution is to take place, it is usually insufficient that "one does not wish way below," but it is necessary that "one is incapable up above" to continue in the old way; (2) the wants and sufferings of the oppressed classes become more acute than usual; (3) in consequence of the above causes, there is a considerable increase in the activity of the masses who in "peace time" allow themselves to be robbed without protest, but in stormy times are drawn both by the circumstances of the crises and *by the "higher-ups" themselves* into independent historic action.

Without these objective changes, which are independent not only of the will of separate groups and parties but even of separate classes, a revolution, as a rule, is impossible. The co-existence of all these objective changes is called a revolutionary situation.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Capitalist Theories of "Planned Economy"

By HARRY GANNES

I.

IN the maze of capitalist anarchy, made more apparent by the violent world economic crisis that has a shattering effect on the creeds of the capitalist economists, along with the standard of living of the workers, the question of planned economy holds a great fascination for the masses.

The Five-Year Plan, and its significance as the harbinger of a new economic order in which the productive forces are controlled by man instead of man being controlled by the productive forces, has become a plague to the leading capitalist spokesmen. Everybody is talking about "planning." The masses see capitalism plunging them deeper into starvation. The gigantic productive structure in the United States, so long the subject of lyrical praise, so long extolled by the Second International as proof of the incorrectness of revoltionary Marxism-Leninism, now visibly flounders in antagonisms. They become so clear that it is no longer necessary for theoretical explanations alone to prove conclusively to the workers that the crisis is one of over-production, of starvation due to plenty. That the productive forces have come in conflict with the social relationships, and that capitalism as it approaches its end plunges the masses into misery and war as a way of perpetuating its system of anarchy, is being demonstrated to millions upon millions.

To the most backward of American workers and farmers, wherever the faintest ideas of planned economy have seeped through, the thought of planning production to end crisis, unemployment, starvation, wage cuts, as well as to advance the productive forces on a general unified scale, while at the same time continuously improving the living status of the workers, has become an immediate issue.

The carrying out of industrial and agricultural projects in the Soviet Union, far exceeding anything hitherto known in human society, has become a powerful force that requires an ideological attack from the leading capitalist spokesmen. Mere ridiculing of the idea of planned economy is no longer feasible. Silence no longer works. Declaring that capitalism has demonstrated itself to be superior to planned economy is like telling the hungry unem-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ployed worker that the steak he ate in 1929 is superior to the meal the Russian worker eats today.

The universities buzz with talk about planned economy, and the capitalists have already created "experts" who are glib in their discussion of planning, such as, for example, Chamberlain, Calvin B. Hoover, Matthew Woll, George Soule, Prof. W. B. Donham and Charles A. Beard. Even the gutter sheets of capitalism such as the Hoover publications and the MacFadden *New York Graphic* could not escape the fascination of the American masses by the idea of planned economy. Both propose a series of phrases that they try to palm off as a "plan."

Finally, President Hoover himself could not escape the power of the enchantment that the idea of "planned economy" holds for the masses. In June of 1931, speaking before the Indiana Republican Editorial Association, Hoover was forced to resort to the baldest demagogy in answer to the Five-Year Plan.

The *Wall Street Journal* of June 17, 1931, expressed the leading imperialists' thanks to Hoover for attempting to beard the lion of planned economy. They repeat the worries of the big bankers over the growing talk about "planning," and feel Hoover did a necessary job in diving into the question, saying:

> "To the spring crop of capped and gowned schoolmen bleating challenges to the existing order and moaning for 'a plan,' President Hoover replied with his own version of 'an American plan' for the next twenty years. What he meant was, clearly enough, that the American people have been working according to their own flexible scheme of ideas for a century and a half; that it has worked marvelously well on the whole and may be expected to continue its successful evolution in the future. To those who react to Russian phenomena with the fear-dictated conviction that America must fall in line with the submission of its further development of some master blue-print, Mr. Hoover made this completely adequate answer:
>
> " 'Some groups believe this plan can only be carried out by a fundamental, a revolutionary change of method. Other groups believe that any system must be the outgrowth of the character of our race, a natural outgrowth of our traditions, that we have established certain ideals, over 150 years, upon which we must build, rather than destroy.' "

Hoover's plan, outside of the admission that the leading representative of the imperialist executive committee was forced to counter the growing popularity of the Five-Year Plan, is outright demagogy.

However, the petty-bourgeoisie have gone further and tried to theorize about possible plans to offer the leading bourgeoisie a way out of the crisis. The fascist Matthew Woll, backed by the warmad James W. Gerard, former ambassador to Germany, has also worked out a "plan." Others like Prof. Wallace Brett Donham,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Dean of Business Economics in the Graduate School of Business Administration at Harvard, speak about "the critical need for a general plan for business," without attempting even to bridge the unbridgable gaps. Always the prospective planners come up against the basic class relationships of capitalist society and the laws of capitalist production as well as the functions of the capitalist state.

Prof. Donham wants nothing disturbed in capitalist society. He wants the classes to remain as they are. He wants the capitalist state to retain its role of dictatorship by the exploiters, yet he wants planning, as he thinks "the lack of plan is largely responsible for our present difficulties." He puts the matter very strongly indeed:

> "What we need is effective, rationally foresighted leadership culminating in philosophically sound plans. On our ability to obtain such leadership in American business, the fate of capitalistic civilization may well depend." Sunday *Times*, March 15, 1931.)

What sort of "plan" Prof. Donham wants, is, of course, as clear as mud. Capitalism, he cries, must be saved through leadership and planning, but its basic relations—private property, the capitalist state, the exploitation of the workers—must not be disarranged.

II.

Another source of American capitalist "planning" is the American Civic Federation, the clearing house of the fascist officials of the American Federation of Labor and the wage-cutting bosses. Their proffered "plan" had the endorsement of James W. Gerard, Elihu Root and Matthew Woll. For a long time the American Civic Federation had directed its energies to "exposing" the "failure" of the Five-Year Plan and to combatting Communism in the United States through fully approved czarist methods. But Matthew Woll decided to exceed the Five-Year Plan by at least one hundred per cent, and therefore issued what he called the American Ten-Year Plan. What was the reason for this sudden notion to plan? The plan itself states:

> "The five-year plan in Russia, according to the evidence of recognized economic authorities both in the United States and abroad, is proving a hopeless failure..." (*Times*, June 15 1931.)

Because of this "failure" Matthew Woll thought it was necessary for capitalism in the United States to make a pretense at planning because of the danger that a revolution might sweep away the "successful" capitalist system in favor of planned economy under proletarian rule. Woll explained, in introducing his plan in a special address on "Economic Planning for America," that: "Revolution has dethroned many rulers, many dynasties, many gov-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ernments within the lifetime of the present generation." Then Woll draws the inference that unless capitalism can stave off its decay, the workers will take matters into their own hands, with the result that planned economy will be instituted through a dictatorship of the proletariat. How is this to be done? Only through fascism, is Woll's answer. He points out: "The most powerful force in the modern state is not the regal ruler of the politicians, but our foremost financiers, capitalists, industrialists and commercialists." These men, Woll declares, should form "a 'super council' getting together to regulate the economic affairs of this nation." The American Federation of Labor officialdom long ago raised the cry of this "super-council" composed, as Woll shows, of the foremost exploiters, to dragoon the workers into channels desired by the capitalists, to put down resistance to wage cuts, to enforce migrations of unemployed workers to scattered districts where they can be interned, and to crush the rising revolutionary wave. Woll's plan, the scheme of the Civic Federation, is merely the continuation of their usual policy of scab-herding, only on a larger and more ambitious scale.

The closer to the practicalities of capitalist life the bourgeoisie are, the more they shy off from any meddling with phrases about "planned economy" under capitalism. The big bankers, the leading capitalist politicians, the "old-reliable" bourgeois economists avoid touching the question with any view to action in the slightest measure. But the petty-bourgeois liberals who feel the ground rocking beneath their feet, panicky in their desire to save capitalism, go to great length in constructing fantastic plans that rest on pure imagination yet lead to the actual support of open capitalist dictatorship, fascism.

III.

It is necessary here to consider only two of the prize examples of these proffered "plans," namely the "'Five-Year Plan' for America," by Charles A. Beard (*Forum*, July, 1931), and "National Planning," by George Soule, (*The New Republic*, Feb. 11, 1931; March 4, 1931; March 11, 1931).

Beard, the liberal historian, first tells us that "Planning is already here; it is inherent in our technological civilization, which is now as American as the individualist agriculture that held the center of the economic stage for two centuries during our early development." Though "planning is already here," we find that Beard goes into a lengthy hodge-podge telling how planning should be adopted. The first step is the establishment of a "National Economic Council, to be formed by Congress, obviously to be headed and controlled by the leading exploiters.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The function of this "National Economic Council" will be similar, Beard tells us, to the recent action of the United States Steel Corporation, the General Motors Co., Ford and the other large trusts. "Procedure here will be in keeping with that already followed by large corporations in the United States—simply on a vaster scale and subject to economic, not legal restrictions."

The central element, of course, being that the capitalist relations are to be left intact, private property is to remain, and if anything, concentrated still further into the hands of a smaller group of capitalists. The "plan" must go on "without violating a single American (read, *capitalist*) economic tradition. Indeed, a far more tender regard could be paid to stock and bondholders than is usual in cases of bankruptcy and reorganization under private banking auspices."

Beard is very solicitous of preserving the profit system, the squeezing of surplus value from the workers, and the maintenance of class relations as part of the "plan." What he wants is the assurance of the income of the petty-bourgeoisie, not national planned economy. Again and again he is concerned about stocks "with graduated dividends based on efficiency in operation."

To emphasize the fact that he in no way wants to disturb the basic elements of capitalist relations, that is, the concentration of the means of production in the hands of the capitalist class, the existence of a propertyless working class forced to work and produce profits for the bosses in order to live, Beard says:

> "From what has been said it is apparent that no confiscation of property is contemplated here. On the contrary, the examples set by the abolition of three of four million dollars' worth of property in slaves during our civil conflict (he means the Civil War), and the destruction of millions invested in the liquor business by prohibition, are put aside *as highly undesirable methods of operating in a technological society.*"

Beard thinks the loss of the value of the Negro slaves to the slave holders by the so-called emancipation was an economic hitch, and thereby infers that the wage slaves must be prevented from emancipating themselves from the domination of capitalism to avoid the abolition of private property. He ends with a note of futility saying: "All this, it may be said, is too large, too general, too remote, and offers no help in the present emergency."

Thus, in spite of the "scientific attempts" to find a "plan" for capitalist economy, he ends with this nullification. Only the call for fascism remains undisturbed, that is the call for "stronger action" on the part of the capitalists.

George Soule's proposal for a plan involves the "creation of a brain for our economy." What this brain is to do and how it

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is to function is a little unclear. All of the positive statements he makes are qualified with so many clauses that the result is but a pious wish for a plan and a hope that some capitalist genuis might construct a readable one if not a practicable one. An example of the clarity of this liberal's "plan," as well as the idea of its central point is contained in the following quotation:

"If we were to have an economic dictatorship," says Soule, "such a body might be unnecessary, but since the job is to coordinate and educate existing authority, a body like this is indispensable."

In other words, a fascist dictatorship (disguised here as an "economic dictatorship") is necessary when capitalism can no longer go on as it is.

Soule, careful of preserving the interests of imperialism in his "plan," even provides for foreign investments, that is, the exploitation of colonial peoples. "Foreign investments will have to be adjusted to needs of production, export and import (all for the sake of the central imperialist authorities who are supposed to do the "planning)."

Always, in these "plans," the key to the productive relations of capitalism, production for profit, the very fountain-head of capitalist anarchy and disorganization is set up as a pivot. "Profits as a payment of management, profits as an inducement to investment, may remain, but they must of necessity be limited and regularized," writes Soule.

This is the petty-bourgeois kernel in the nut of proposed capitalist "planning." "Profits as an inducement to investment" remain. The worker is sweated for the creation of profits, and the anarchy in production goes merrily on while the sheaf of "plans" are thrown in the waste bascket.

Invariably, the proposals for planning by the petty-bourgeois confusionists can be summed up, not as a plea for economic planning at all, but for a capitalist messiah, and ultimately for fascism as a shield against the advances of the revolutionary working class which threatens real planned economy by first clearing away capitalist anarchy and establishing the proletarian dictatorship.

The chattering of the liberals for a new form of state to deal with economic problems, is an attempt to dodge the sharpening class forces. "In captalist society," said Lenin in the thesis on bourgeois democracy and the dictatorship of the proletariat, submitted to the First Congress of the Communist International, "there can be no middle course between capitalist dictatorship and proletarian dictatorship. Any dream of a third course is merely the reactionary lament of the lower middle class."

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IV.

More crafty than any of the so-called plans of the liberals is the one proposed by Gerard Swope, president of the General Electric Co., a Morgan concern, and closely affiliated to the imperialist government in Washington.

Without offering any such ends as "planned economy," the Swope proposal, under the slogan of "coordinating production and consumption," lays the basis for the extension of the domination of the leading imperialists, the closer merging of these imperialists with the state, and the enforcing on the workers of a charity system, which Swope calls unemployment insurance and pension schemes.

As matters stand at present, Swope says, "co-ordination of production is impossible under our present laws, and it is vain to think of either amendment or repeal. . . ." Hence, what is needed, he argues, is an extra-legal body to be composed of the leading imperialists like Swope, Henry Ford, J. P. Morgan, Owen D. Young, who will make it easier for these imperialists to concentrate industry in their hands and wield more direct power in crushing the workers. In short, the merger of the capitalist state with the leading imperialists would be complete, so that all threads would be in their hands, and a high-sounding, paternalistic scheme of "insurance" would be instituted (to be taken out of the wages of the workers), and if this method does not work, open fascism would then be a simple transition.

The Swope proposal is baldly in the interests of the leading imperialists. For instance, one of the main points is that "Organized industry should take the lead." By "organized industry" Swope makes it clear he means the big trusts. There would then take place the following centralization under the lead of so-called "organized industry."

"All industrial and commercial companies (including subsidiaries) with 50 or more employes, and doing an interstate business, may form a trade association which shall be under the supervision of a federal body referred to later."

This federal body would contain the representatives of the leading imperialists within the capitalist state and from that end rule these centralized industries; and the trade association themselves, of course, would be dominated by the leading trusts.

Swope goes on to propose a further strengthening of the hold of the imperialists—in other words, through every means intensifying to the highest pitch all the basic contradictions of capitalism—by all sorts of schemes such as price-fixing, and the establishment of a "standard accounting and cost system," which would be under the supervision of the leading bankers.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

That a great section of the proposal contains demagogic promises of "unemployment insurance" and "old age pensions" is purposely put in to mislead the workers into a support of this imperialist scheme to strengthen the hold of the dominant trusts is shown by the fact that Swope, and those who support his "plan," now fight to the last ditch as anathema the mere mention of unemployment insurance. Why their sudden disapproval of these schemes when "organized industry" takes the lead?

This merging process of the leading imperialists and the state apparatus which Swope puts forward so openly has been going on for some time. The Sixth Congress of the Communist International showed the development of this process, declaring:

> "The centralization of capital and the absorption, through the medium of the banking system, of large landed property into the general finance capitalist organizations, help more and more to consolidate the combined forces of the big exploiters, whose organizations are becoming directly grafted on to the organs of state power."

This is a characterization of Swope's proposal several years before he made it.

Thus from every angle it is clear that the talk of "planning" within capitalism is an attempt not to get away from the present relations but to strengthen them, to insure the hold of the capitalists on their private property, their profits, and to perpetuate the wage slavery of the workers.

Always the central theme becomes the action of the state. And invariably this action leads to fascization. While all else in these plans is the wildest confusion, this fact of fascist development, that is the open dictatorship of the capitalist state, is undeniable and the essence of the "plans."

While the economic crisis leads to the forcing of the capitalist state to show its hand more and more as the dictatorship of the capitalist class, the mask of democracy is still retained. Even the so-called plans, which are calls for fascism pure and simple, speak of the "preservation of liberty," and the heritage of democracy." We must remember that these plans are proposals for fascism, preparing the ideological ground for this step, though action has not been taken in this direction. The 13th Plenum of the Central Committee of the C. P. U. S. A., defined the present period in the United States with relation to fascism as follows:

> "Though increasing the elements of fascization, the main method of rule of U. S. finance capital is still, in the main, carried on under the mask of democracy, which in principle by no means differs from open (fascist) dictatorship."

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The confusion of many of the capitalists about the most elementary ideas of planned economy is shown by their claim that "organization," "control" or "planning" is already here in such large industries as the General Electric Co., the American Telephone and Telegraph Co., etc.

The organization of the productive forces within an individual industrial establishment is based on factors directly opposite to general social planning. Profit, the motive force of capitalist production, brings about this organization of the labor forces in the various factories with the result that the blind production for the general market is speeded up so that the sum total of these individual organizations results in greater social disorganization and greater chaos.

Engels expressed this fact very clearly in his anti-Duehring. He said:

> "The contradiction between the social form of production and capitalist oppropriation, reproduces itself as the antagonism and conflict between the organization of production in the individual factories, and the anarchy of production in the entire society."

American industry is the best illustration of this. With the highly organized Ford plant, with the tremendous consolidation of productive forces in the United States Steel Corporation, and with the thousand and one individual units of production of like type, efficiently squeezing out surplus value almost to the last drop, we find that at the present time the nature of the economic crisis in the United States reveals with the greatest clarity the contradictions of the capitalist system. There is the conflict between industry and agriculture, which is greater in the United States than elsewhere. The speed of the development of the permanent army of unemployed here exceeds all records. The absolute impoverishment of the working class, and the impossibility of continuing production on a capitalist base for long periods without very soon reaching saturation and over-production is so clearly foreseeable that many leading capitalist economists grasp at the most childlish suggestions for a solution.

Even in Marx' day, the bourgeoisie who favored the most intensive organization of the workers in the individual factories for the creation of surplus value, realized that an extension of the principle to society as a whole would involve the rupture of capitalist relations, and the preliminary disappearance of private property and with it the capitalist systems.

> "The very same bourgeois mentality," wrote Marx, "which extols the manufacturing division of labor, the life-long annexation of the worker to a partial operation, and the unconditional subordi-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> nation of the detail worker to capital, extols them as an organization of labor which increases productivity—denounces just as loudly every kind of deliberate social control and regulation of the social process of production, denounces it as an invasion of the inviolable property rights, liberty, and the self-determining genius of the individual capitalist. It is characteristic that the inspired apologist of the factory system can find nothing worse to say of any proposal for the general organization of social labor, than that it would transform the whole of society into a factory." (*Capital*, vol. I, p.376.)

The success of the Five-Year-Plan has transformed the methods of the apologists of capitalism.

Thus, in speaking of the capitalists' attempt to plan production in order to preserve capitalism, the present day apologists for the system of exploitation try, by a few words, to wipe out the basic relations of capitalist society, the class forces, and the ever widening contradictions of capitalism which grow with the decay of capitalism. While the individual capitalist correctly views profit, the returns on his "investments," as the real aim and proof of the "success" of the various capitalist ventures, the capitalist economists attempt to state that the sum total of the productive forces in so-called normal times is in reality more or less well-regulated production for the national needs. From this they argue it is necessary just to shift around a bit adequately and smoothly to satisfy these "national needs."

> "It is a false abstraction," says Marx, "to regard a nation, whose mode of production is based upon value and otherwise capitalistically organized, as an aggregate body working merely for the satisfaction of national wants." (*Capital*, vol. II, p. 992.)

This false idea of capitalism is precisely the one that the "socialists" advance. It reaches its logical conclusion in the action of Ramsay MacDonald who believes that greater hunger for the workers is necessary to preserve "the nation."

It is to hide the fact that becomes ever clearer, that the capitalist mode of production, producing for profit, incubates on an ever-expanding scale, the many contradictions of that system, that the bourgeois economists try to argue that planning is feasible within capitalism.

Not until capitalism is swept away, with all its class relationships and its basic contradictions, will planned economy with its conscious mastering of the productive forces come into being.

Capitalism can never speak of production for social needs as it comes to a stop periodically "at a point determined by the production and realization of profit, not by the satisfaction of social needs."

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This is shown precisely by the fact that capitalist production declines and continues to decline when the social needs are greatest, when more millions are hungry, unclothed and homeless, and when want is the condition of a great section of the population.

As the leading capitalist countries plunge deeper into crisis, developing violent financial spasms, the talk about "planning" within the capitalist structure gives way to the more immediate question of attempting to save capitalism from bankruptcy and collapse.

In the United States the "plans" of Swope, Beard, Woll *et al* are shoved into the background by the frantic efforts of Hoover and the foremost Wall Street bankers to set up a credit pool to keep the banking system from toppling into the chasm opened up by the general economic crisis. It is not a question of future "planning" to smooth the road of capitalism, but an immediate problem of avoiding catastrophe. In this situation all talk of "planning" goes more and more away from any hodge-podge schemes of "organization" of productive forces, and the emphasis is put on the political necessity of fascism to save capitalism. Hoover's call for "national unity" is a step in this direction. The talk about a "moratorium" in politics, coming from many capitalist sources is the conscious bourgeois expression of the desire to do away with the frills of democracy and to step out with the open capitalist dictatorship.

Unable to deny the danger of collapse of the capitalist system, one of the most powerful Wall Street banks, the National City Bank, in its October, 1931, Bulletin, alongside of the admission of the growing severity of every phase of the crisis of capitalism, is forced to consider an ideological attack against planned economy.

Their arguments about the inherent "stability" and "workability" of capitalism become particularly ludicrous in connection with the events of the day. They admit that the guiding principle of capitalism is the drive for profits, before which everything else must give way. "Nothing in their history or traditions supports for a moment the view that the American people (read, American bankers) would want a perfectly ordered and stable world at the price they would have to pay for it," they write. They go on to insist that capitalist anarchy must be maintained and that the way out of the crisis should be left to the individual capitalists "seeking to make profits or to avert losses."

Thus, this powerful Morgan bank, whose article is reprinted by the influential Wall Street sheet, the *Annalist*, with full approval, calls for a halt to the talk of "planning" as a dangerous discussion leading the masses ultimately to the conclusion that planned economy signifies first the wiping out of capitalist anarchy and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Present Struggle in Cuba

By O. RODRIGUEZ

EDITOR'S NOTE: *This article was written at the time of the Nationalist conflict with Machado. In spite of its delayed publication it still retains interest.*

THE decision of the bourgeois opposition to enter into armed struggle against Machado at this time was undoubtedly hastened by the fact that the working class of Cuba under the leadership of its revolutionary unions and the Communist Party, is beginning to assume leadership of all exploited classes in the revolutionary fight against the Machado government and Yankee imperialism. The strike of the street carmen, and the 24-hour political mass strike on August 4th, which received the support of wide circles of the poor petty bourgeoisie of the cities, demonstrate the growing revolutionary upsurge and the increasing leading role of the working class and our Party in the anti-imperialist struggle.

These events have confirmed the correctness of the political line and the main tasks of the Cuban Party as formulated in the April Letter of the Bureau, elaborated in the May issue of *El Comunista*. The Party must now increase manifold its efforts for the fulfilment of these tasks.

The deepening crisis, and the policy of Machado and Yankee imperialism to place the burden of the crisis upon the toiling and exploited masses (unemployment, wage cuts, Chadbourne Plan, Emergency Law, terror, etc.), are producing deep revolutionary fermentation in Cuba at an increasing rate. By unfolding the daily struggles of the masses (strikes against wage cuts, fight for unemployment relief, against the terror etc.), and linking up these struggles for the immediate demands with the general fight against the bourgeois-imperialist peace pact, the Communist Party of Cuba has been waging a correct struggle for the proletarian hegemony in the anti-imperialist agrarian revolution. The generally correct policy of the Party in the carmen's strike and in the August 4th political strike must be developed further and be applied also locally and on a provincial basis.

It is primarily because of the deepening crisis, the growing revolutionary upsurge and the increasing leading role of the working class and of our Party that Yankee imperialism has not yet succeeded in its efforts to consolidate the bourgeois-imperialist front against the Cuban masses. Yankee imperialism is continuing its

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

efforts to establish "peace" in the bourgeois-imperialist camp on the program of hunger and terror for the masses at the same time preparing to intervene with its navy and marines to crush the revolutionary struggles of the masses. The *New York Times* is calling for a "truce" between Machado and the bourgeois opposition fearing the rise of the masses under revolutionary leadership. Other sections of the Yankee bourgeoisie are expressing the same attitude.

The bourgeois opposition, of which the leaders of the Nationalist Union form a part, have undertaken to knock the leadership out of the hands of the working class and of the Communist Party. Menocal, Mendieta, Hevia, Capote & Co. felt compelled to initiate the present armed struggle for the double purpose of (a) to retard and check the maturing of the revolution of the workers and peasants, and (b) to strengthen their own position against Machado in order to secure the recognition and support of Yankee imperialism as the next government of Cuba.

It would be, however, a fatal error to assume that Menocal, Mendieta and Co. will undertake to develop the present armed conflict into a real revolutionary struggle of the masses against the Machado regime and Yankee imperialism. The main strategy of the leaders of the Nationalist Union and of the Conservatives, which together make up the bourgeois opposition, is to secure the confidence and support of Wall Street and Yankee imperialism and to supplant Machado as a *more* efficient and effective servant of Yankee imperialism in Cuba. That is why Guggenheim has openly professed friendship for the bourgeois opposition, while rendering all support to Machado. That is why Wall Street and the Yankee sugar barons express now confidence that even if the bourgeois opposition wins, the interests of Yankee imperialism in Cuba will not suffer.

The real danger to Yankee imperialism and to the native exploiters—the landlords and the bourgeoisie—lies in the developing revolutionary upsurge of the masses under the leadership of the Communist Party. This danger the bourgeois opposition fears more than it fears Machado. The entry of wide masses of workers and peasants into the revolutionary struggle with their own social and political demands will find the bourgeois opposition in the same camp with Machado and Yankee imperialism trying to crush mercilessly the rising masses and their revolutionary organizations.

On the other hand, we must remember that among the rank and file followers of the leaders of the Nationalist Union there are elements of the peasantry, the poor petty-bourgeoisie of the cities and also workers that are able and willing to wage a revolutionary fight against Machado and Yankee imperialism, although these ele-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ments still have illusions about their nationalist leaders. It is also the fear of losing control of these elements that forced Mendieta and Co. to initiate the armed struggle in order to betray it as was proven by their readiness to surrender to Machado. Because of this fact, the present armed struggle against Machado, which is developing in the surroundings of growing mass revolutionary upsurge and the increasing leading role of the working class and the Communist Party, is bound to continue longer and spread out wider (especially among the peasantry of the Eastern provinces) than is called for by the plans and strategy of the bourgeois opposition. These elements *we must win* for our Program of Action, for the revolutionary anti-imperialist united front under the leadership of the working class. If we do so, Mendieta and Co., will find it, this time, very difficult much more so than in the past, to manipulate the struggles of the masses and to keep them within the prescribed bourgeois limits.

This situation imposes upon the Communist Party the following main tasks:

1. To deepen and widen the present struggle by drawing into the fight, under our slogans and banners (the Program of Action), the widest masses of workers, peasants and poor petty-bourgeoisie of the cities, exposing systematically the inevitable treachery of the bourgeois opposition (especially the leaders of the Nationalist Union) and its transition to an open alliance with Yankee imperialism to put into effect Guggenheim's peace pact of hunger and terror for the masses.

2. To intensify manifold our fight to retain and extend the leadership of the working class and the Communist Party in the revolutionary fight against Machado and Yankee imperialism, *arousing the peasantry* (especially in the eastern provinces) and the poor petty bourgeoisie and rallying them around the working class and its revolutionary organizations.

3. To develop the most intensive activities to build and strengthen the class struggle unions (especially the agricultural workers and semi-proletarians on the plantations), to build the Unemployed Councils, to organize Peasant Leagues, and to recruit into the Party the advanced proletarians, semi-proletarians and poor peasants, building and strengthening the Party nuclei and the general Party organization. We must intensify the fight for revolutionary trade union unity, exposing the demagogy of the reformists and applying systematically the policy of the united front from below in the daily struggles of the workers.

Our main tactic at the present time consists in unfolding most energetically the daily struggles of the masses of workers and peasants on the basis of their immediate demands (strikes against wage

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cuts, hunger marches for unemployment relief, peasant strikes and struggles for relief and land, etc.), linking up these fights with the general struggle for the Program of Action, deepening the struggle into political strikes and demonstrations locally, provincially and nationally. The organization of workers' and peasants' defense corps must be pursued most energetically.

On the basis of these activities, and with the unfolding and further development of the mass struggles, the Party will be confronted with the need of creating *open organs of mass struggle* with which to embrace and organize the revolutionary activities of the masses. It is therefore necessary that we begin to popularize the slogan: *"Organize Councils of Action to Fight for Your Program."** The actual organization of the Councils of Action will have to be done in the process of unfolding the mass struggles and to be started in those localities and provinces where the revolutionary upsurge is most advanced and where the mass movement is strong enough to make possible the open existence of the Councils of Action in *defiance of the decrees of the government.*

We must fight against the danger of opportunist passivity and lagging behind the masses in the present situation as the main *danger.* At the same time, we must fight against all tendencies toward "putchism" and "left" sectarianism. Only in this way will the Communist Party of Cuba be able to fulfil its tasks.

At the same time, it must be emphasized once more that the assistance of the revolutionary working class movement in the United States to the Cuban revolution is *totally insufficient.* Our comrades in the United States have apparently not yet realized to the full extent their duties to the national-liberation movements in the colonies, especially those that are held in bondage by Yankee imperialism.

We have followed with admiration the unfolding of the struggle in the United States for Negro equality and the right of self-determination, in connection with the Scottsboro and Camp Hill struggles, under the leadership of the C.P.U.S.A. The revolutionary vanguard in Latin America led by the Communist Parties, has joined enthusiastically in this fight, making the Scottsboro issue one of the outstanding slogans in the August 1st and 23rd demonstrations. *The same kind of fight* must be carried on by the proletariat in the United States in support of the revolutionary struggles in the Yankee colonies.

The Eleventh Plenum of E.C.C.I. points out as one of the

*At the present time this can be only a propaganda slogan. It was correctly advanced as a slogan of action at the time of the Nationalist conflict with Machado. Now the slogan of Workers' and Peasants' Committees should be advanced.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

weaknesses of our sections "the absolutely inadequate support rendered by the Communist Parties in the imperialist countries to the revolutionary movement for liberation in the colonies and semi-colonies." This is becoming a most dangerous weakness at the present time when the revolutionary upsurge in Latin America is rising and when foreign imperialism (especially that of the U.S.A.) is making most desperate efforts to stem the maturing revolutions of the workers and peasants.

The Cuban working class, at the head of the peasantry and the toiling masses generally, stands today in the front-line trenches of the revolutionary fight against the domination of Wall Street. Despite the unspeakable terror of Machado and the demagogy of the reformists, the revolutionary workers of Cuba are building the Communist Party and their class struggle unions, coming ever more to the forefront as the leaders of the anti-imperialist revolution.

It is the foremost duty of the proletariat of the U.S.A. and of its Communist Party to render daily and active support to the revolutionary struggle of the Cuban masses and their revolutionary organizations.

EXTRACT FROM LETTERS ON TACTICS, WRITTEN BY LENIN IN 1917

Marxism demands of us a most exact, an objectively verifiable analysis of the interrelations of classes and of the concrete peculiarities of each historic moment. We Bolsheviks have always tried to be true to this demand, which is absolutely imperative from the standpoint of giving a scientific foundation to politics.

"Our doctrine is not a dogma, but a guide to action," said Marx and Engels, who always scorned the mere acquisition and repetition of "formulae," capable at best only of outlining *general* tasks, which are necessarily changed by the concrete economic and political circumstances of each particular period in the historical process.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Philosophical Discussion in the C.P.S.U. in 1930-31

By D. S. MIRSKY

THE recent philosophical discussion in the C.P.S.U. is of considerable interest for all sections of the C. I., both as a contribution towards a better understanding of some fundamental problems of Marxian theory, and as an episode in that progressive bolshevization of all aspects of life in the Soviet Union which is such a prominent feature of these last years. Before, roughly, 1928-29 all the best cultural, theoretical and ideological forces of the C.P.S.U. were absorbed in practical—political and administrative—work; the masses, apart from a still relatively small vanguard of industrial workers were still below the level reached by the advanced capitalist countries, though on the other hand their political position had given them a momentum which assured their "outstripping" the latter before long (in fact the cultural level of advanced capitalist countries can never be reproduced in the Soviet Union, for it is surpassed in some respects before it is attained in others). Cultural work in all fields, in so far as it was not a direct part of the political and administrative work of the Party was carried on by intellectuals who though many of them were loyal to the proletariat, were essentially part and parcel of the old bourgeois world. The suppression of ideological forces hostile to Socialism, was conducted in a spirit of what in the light of later developments may appear as excessive "liberalism." All forces that were not explicitly opposed to the cause of Communism were tolerated and even encouraged, and an intelligentsia, democratic to be sure, but by no means proletarian was allowed to subsist in all fields of ideological work, such as the Kulak (who too is a plebian and a democrat!) was allowed to carry on in the villages.

The opposition between "specialist" and Communist subsisted in all fields of work, except the purely political. Communists who were at the same time "specialists" were relatively rare and the bourgeois specialist had, even in the eyes of Communists an authority and a prestige that showed few signs of diminishing. A characteristic feature of the period was the important role played by former Mensheviks, who had given up political opposition but retained their fundamentally un-Communist mentality. They were greatly helped by their familiarity with Marxist terminology, and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their influence was great. But by their side purely bourgeois specialists were everywhere prominent. Even such a politically responsible institution as the Gosplan (State Planning Commission) was heavily staffed with ex-Mensheviks and frankly bourgeois economists. More purely technical institutions, such as the Thermo-Technical Institute, whose director was the notorious Ramzin, were entirely run by "specialists."

This state of things which could work to a certain extent as long as an apparent lull in the class struggle continued became intolerable as soon as the new Revolutionary advance of 1929-30 began. Class enemies, however disguised or however carefully observed, could no longer be allowed to dominate cultural life. The essential "Party" character of all its sides became inescapably apparent, and made the Bolshevization of all aspects of intellectual activity an immediate necessity. The most striking expression of the growing danger were the trials of the wreckers in the winter of 1930-31, but parallel to these, less spectacular developments took place in more purely theoretical fields where between 1929 and the present day a great spring-cleaning has been carried out with the result that bourgeois and Menshevik specialists have been deprived of the means of further ideological sabotage, while at the same time all petit-bourgeois deviations of Communism have been ruthlessly held up to the light and subjected to the most vigorous and thoroughgoing criticism. Important episodes in this progress were the reform of the Academy of Science (1929) and the discussions carried out in a number of special departments. Among the most important are the economic discussions against Bukharin and the Menshevik, Rubin, the literary discussion against Pereverzev and the philosophical discussion which is the subject of the present article.

A landmark of primary importance for all sectors of the ideological front was Stalin's speech at the Conference of Marxist Workers in Agrarian Economy in December, 1929, in which he pointed out that the development of Marxist theory had been lagging behind Communist practice and that it was high time to make up for this lag. The new stage reached by the revolution which was already the initial stage of actual Socialism demanded increased theoretical energy in studying the new conditions and creatively applying to them the method of dialectical materialism. Stalin dwelt in detail only on some problems of economic theory, but the effect of his speech was felt in all departments of theoretical work. It became also the starting point of the philosophical discussion.

The systematic advancement of Marxist philosophy as a special study in the Soviet Union dates from the founding in 1922 of the review *Under the Banner of Marxism*, which was to unite Marxism

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

workers in the fields of philosophy and natural science.[1] For one of the first numbers of the new journal Lenin wrote an article on the *Tasks of Militant Materialism* (English translation in *The Labour Monthly*, January, 1931), in which he emphasized the necessity for Marxist philosophy of never becoming divorced from Communist practice. The article remains a program for any journal of the kind that might be founded by any section of the C.I., but the newly-founded journal failed to carry out Lenin's indications, and it was only as a result of the discussion of 1930-31 that his program was at last realized. Instead, *Under the Banner of Marxism* became the organ of professional philosophers, headed by A. M. Deborin and who came to be known as the "philosophical leadership." It was not only in *Under the Banner of Marxism* that they were paramount, the teaching of philosophy in the most important cultural institutions was also practically monopolized by them.

Deborin was a professional philosopher well equipped in his specialty. Before the Revolution he had published an *Introduction to Dialectical Materialism*, which is a valuable survey of the doctrines that contributed in the genesis of Marxist philosophy. He was a disciple of Plekhanov and a Menshevik, and he had more than once committed himself to virulent attacks against Lenin. After the Revolution he left the Mensheviks and became one of those "non-Party Marxists" who in the early years of the Nep were given every encouragement to propagate Marixst ideas without necessarily supporting the general line of the C.P.S.U. Before long, however, Deborin was admitted as a member of the Party and (unlike Riazanov, the director of the Marx-Engels Institute, another ex-Menshevik raised to a responsible position in the C. P., who was involved in the conspiracy of the Menshevik wreckers) has remained politically above suspicion.[2] For some time his philosophical supremacy remained unchallenged (except by the mechanicists, of whom later on), and it was not tilll the great wave of Bolshevization in 1930 that it became generally clear that his position was to say the least by no means identical with genuine Marxism.

[1] The close connection between Philosophy and Natural Science in the Soviet educational system is consonant with the materialist character of this philosophy, and stands in contrast with the bourgeois method of including philosophy in the "Faculty of Arts."

It may here be the place to point out that contrary to what is so often affirmed in the bourgeois press, non-Marxist philosophy is by no means proscribed or prohibited in the Soviet Union. It is sufficient to mention the fact that the philosopher Losey, an outspoken idealist with a strong mystical tinge, goes on publishing his works at the rate of about a volume a year.

[2] Some of his immediate entourage, however, took part in the Trotskyist opposition and in the "right-left bloc" of Syrtsov-Lominadze.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This state of affairs was largely due to the fact that all the best theoretical thought of genuine Communists was at that time entirely absorbed in the practical work of the Party and was not advertised as a theory, but seemed to be "merely" a necessary ingredient of that practical work. It was not realized with sufficient explicitness that theory is never anything more than "merely" such a necessary accompaniment of revolutionary practice. The "unity of theory and practice" continued of course to be recognized as a fundamental element of Marxism, but the practical workers had no time as it were to insist on this principle in a theoretical way, while theoreticians like Deborin were content to pay theoretical lip-service to it.

On the other hand the Deborinites did some good work in combating the "mechanicists," that is to say those unphilosophical materialists, recruited for the most part from among scientists who had joined the C.P. (their leader was A. K. Timiryazev, the son of the eminent biologist, who had been the first big man of science to raise his voice in defense of the October Revolution, and himself a biologist of considerable achievement) but who, like all the rank and file of bourgeois scientists, are constitutionally averse to all philosophy. Their slogan was "Science is its own philosophy." Subjectively they were good Communists and honest materialists, but their adherence to the unphilosophical and antiquated mechanistic outlook of the 19th century and their contempt for philosophical training made them objectively ideological wreckers in so far as they tried to deprive the proletariat of such a powerful weapon as the dialectical method. Their inadequate philosophical equipment prevented them from realizing the political implications of their mechanistic theory and its essential identity with the mechanistic and anti-dialectical pseudo-Marxism of Bukharin, which by the beginning of the period of reconstruction had become the theoretical gospel of the Right Wing. Deborin and his followers did a great deal to show up the anti-Marxist character of the theories of the mechanicists as well as Bukharin. Their real services in this direction obscured for some time the fact that they had themselves deviated in an opposite direction, into something essentially different from Marxism.

If the mechanicists had neglected or rejected dialectic and advocated a materialism that was neither capable of explaining revolutionary practice nor consonant with the recent advances in physical science, Deborin by unduly emphasizing dialectic as distinct from materialism, tended to substitute for dialectical materialism a dialectical scholasticism that was devoid of material content and thus virtually idealistic. Fascinated by the form of dialectical reasoning, the Deborinites paid slight attention to the affairs of every day, and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ignored the theoretical implications of practical developments, such as the changes introduced into society by the work of the proletarian dictatorship. Theory tended to be divorced from practice and this contained the germs of a surrender of the materialist position, for materialism is inseparable from the subordination of theoretical activity to the demands of practical work. From the guide to action which it should be in the hands of revolutionary Marxists dialectic as handled by Deborin degenerated into an academic scholasticism, and the philosopher into a pundit spinning out his categories without any relation to the work going on around him. An uncritical attitude of Hegel (whose dialectic stood on its idealistic head, and had to be placed on materialistic feet before it could be of any use for the cause of Communism) became a characteristic factor of the "philosophical leadership."

Both the mechanicists and the Deborinites represented deviations from genuine Marxism which might be tolerated during the relative lull in the class struggle, but which became intolerable in the conditions created by the great Socialist offensive of 1929-30. Both, ultimately, had their roots in petit-bourgeois mentality and contained the germs of policies hostile to the proletariat. The mechanicists, though they themselves ignored the identity of their doctrines with those of Bukharin, were, like the Right Wing, a reflection inside the Party of the outlook and interests of the survivals of capitalist economy, a form, virtually, of petit-bourgeois Liberalism, which ignores the revolutionary force of dialectic, and tries to deprive the proletariat of its most powerful ideological weapon, a consistent and united theory of philosophical materialism. Their slogan, "science is its own philosophy," in practise amounted to a surrender of ideological supremacy to bourgeois scientists.

The signal for the overhauling of the philosophical, as of other ideological sectors, was given, as I have said, by Stalin's speech in December, 1929. The campaign against Deborin was started in the early summer of 1930 by a group of young philosophers and scientists, members for the most part of the Institute of Red Professors of Philosophy and Natural Science, among whom the most active were Mitin, Raltsevich, Yudin, Maksimov and Kolman; a letter to the *Pravda*, signed by the three first-named, started the offensive which was actively supported by some old Bolsheviks, especially by Yaroslavsky. The Deborinites answered by a vigorous counter-offensive and all the latter part of 1930 was occupied by a very lively discussion which ended by a complete defeat of the "philosophical leadership." It was Stalin again who raised the debate to a higher theoretical level and dotted the i's. The young philosophers had attacked Deborin for excessive abstractedness of thought and a

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

neglect of co-ordinating theory and practice. Stalin in an interview given in 1931, pointed out that this abstract formalism and neglect of practice were nothing less than a form of idealism, for materialism is materialism only as long as it regards abstract categories as one with their material content and theory as the servant of practise. The organizational outcome of the discussion was an overhauling of the editorial board of *Under the Banner of Marxism*; the new board was composed of men capable of keeping in the general line and of replacing the abstract scholasticism of the Deborinites by the genuine dialectical materialism of Marx, Lenin and the C.P.[3]

The campaign against Debornism was enormously advanced by the recent publication of the posthumous philosophical papers of Lenin. The fact that Lenin had been the greatest philosopher since Marx, though dimly felt, was far from being explicitly recognized in the early years of the Soviet regime. The Deborinites in particular regarded Plekhanov as the greatest of theoretical Marxists and liked to dwell on the difference between the great theoretician, Plekhanov, and the great revolutionary, Lenin. This uncritical acceptance of Plekhanov was one of the most blatant expressions of the way that Deborin ignored the unity of theory and practise, for it is obvious that Plekhanov, who had so badly deviated from Communism in political practise (support of the Mensheviks, condemnation of armed insurrection in 1905, imperialistic attitude during the great war) could hardly have been above suspicion as a theoretical Marxist. The publication (mainly in 1929-30) of Lenin's posthumous papers dealt a death blow to Deborin's conception of the relation between Plekhanov and Lenin, and showed that precisely as a philosopher Lenin was immeasurably superior to Plekhanov, who, though an exceedingly valuable exponent of Marxism, still has to be utilized with considerable critical circumspection. But the posthumous papers were only a glaring proof of Lenin's greatness as a philosopher and by no means exhausted his philosophical significance. A great service of the young philosophers who rebelled against Deborin was that they insisted on the primary importance of the application of philosophy, *i. e.*, of the dialectical method, to con-

[3] It is characteristic that Deborin and the mechanicist leader, Timiryazev, have been retained as members of the board, and thus given a chance of doing useful work. It is also characteristic that while *Under the Banner of Marxism* has been reformed in the direction of a closer connection with practical work, the more popular mass-journal of the Cultural Revolution, the fortnightly *Revolution and Culture* was, about the same time reformed in an opposite direction so as to raise its theoretical level. The unity of theory and practise implies in an equal measure the subordination of theoretical thought to the demands of revolutionary practise, and the firm grounding of all practical work in theoretical consciousness.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

crete problems. Deborin treated dialectic as a system of abstract formulas to be elaborated by professional philosophers shut up in their studies. His critics insisted that dialectic was inseparable from action and must be studied primarily in the process of its applicaton; there can be no such thing as a system of dialectical logic fixed for ever and to be studied as an academical subject. The fundamental conceptions ("categories") of dialectical thought are inseparable from their material content, *i. e.*, from the material reality of the world which is constant change. The best way of studying dialectic is not by poring over the *Logic* of Hegel, but by examining the way Marx applied it in *Capital* to the study of capitalist society; by studying Lenin's revolutionary responses to the changing reality of his time; or the work of the Communist Party in constructing Socialism. The great philosophic achievement of these last years, said the anti-Deborinites, is contained not in the treatises of a small group of professional dialecticians, but in the policy of the C.P.S.U. and of the Comintern, embodied in their theses and resolutions, and in the writings of such leaders as Stalin.

An important aspect of the discussion was the reassertion by the anti-Deborinites of the Leninist attitude towards the present crisis of physical science. The mechanicists had rejected all the new theories of bourgeois scientists—Planck's quanta, Einstein's relativity, Schroedinger's indetermination, Dirac's wave-mechanics—thus ignoring in many cases real scientific discoveries which they agreed to leave unnoticed and condemning science to remain chained to the mechanistic conceptions of the 19th century. Deborin, on the other hand, uncritically accepted the same theories regarding them as dialectical and failing to distinguish between the spontaneously dialectical statement of actually observed facts and the idealistic or agnostic conclusions drawn from them. Of course even Deborin drew the line short of such blatantly idealistic conclusions as those of Eddington, but many virtually idealistic views filtered by degrees into the doctrine of Deborinites and came to be accepted as part of dialectical materialism. Planck, Einstein, Schroedinger came to be regarded as authorities in questions of scientific logic and as genuine, if not quite one hundred per cent, dialectical materialists. The critics of Deborin reaffirmed what Lenin (in *Materialism and Empirio-criticism*) had established in connection with an earlier stage of the present crisis of physics. Physical science, in the hands of bourgeois workers was no doubt on the one hand spontaneously giving birth to what was a confused form of dialectical materialism. But while the new facts were inconsistent with the mechanistic materialism of the 19th century, the bourgeois scientists interpreted them as inconsistent with any kind of materialism. This was due in a

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

certain degree to a *bona-fide* philosophical ignorance of men unacquainted with dialectical materialism and of course incapable of independently evolving it. But it was still more a response to the demands of the decadent bourgeois society of the age of imperialism which they served and which expected of them arguments against materialism and in favor of "spiritual values." Thus it was necessary to distinguish in all these modern theories between a sound scientific kernel which was spontaneously materialistic and dialectical and which must be accepted as a real advance of knowledge, and an ideological and philosophical element which enveloped this healthy kernel and was merely one of the numerous weeds grown on the putrified soil of deathbound capitalism. The only right attitude towards all these theories is one of critical acceptance which preserves and uncovers the valuable scientific, while rejecting the ideological, husk. Whether openly paraded by Eddington, Jeans and Bertrand Russell or discreetly veiled by Einstein, Planck and Heisenberg, the philosophy woven into the new physical theories is entirely conditioned by the ideological needs of a ruling class approaching its doom, which is afraid of truth and asks for any weapon that might stay the advance of proletarian materialism. More than ever the fundamental Leninist assertion about all philosophy that it is always an affair of Party politics (*i. e.*, of class interests) is obviously and palpably true. The uncompromising reassertion of this fundamental truth is the greatest service rendered to the working class of the world by the young Soviet philosophers who attacked Deborin. But this is only half the truth for a philosophy which is consistent with the revolutionary interests of the proletariat is also the only philosophy that is consistent with objective truth.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Cultural Compulsives or Calverton's Latest Caricature of Marxism

By A. LANDY

III.

(*Concluded from the October Issue*)

THE second pillar of Calverton's theory of "cultural compulsives" is the dogma that objectivity is impossible in the social sciences. In Calverton's opinion, a person can be objective only in the abstract physical sciences, where the "method is quantitative and not comparative, and where the issues do not strike at the essential structure of social life."

The social sciences, he maintains, are too intimately tied up with "living culture" and the emotional elements are too strong to allow the kind of scientific analysis which is needed for objective clarification. This was the case, for example, in Engels' acceptance of Morgan's anthropological doctrines; and it was not because Engels personally was exceptionally biased or uncritical, but because no one is free from the pressure of class interests or cultural compulsives.

In fact, according to Calverton, "cultural compulsives are *necessary* to social thought. Without them social thought would lack unity and integration and become as meaningless as doctorate theses in the weakest *e's* in Chaucer."

In spite of this, Calverton complains, sociologists fail to understand the social importance of these compulsives. They do not understand that "their own thought, as well as the thought they have analyzed, is governed just as distinctly by the presence and pressure of cultural compulsives; that all social thought is colored by such compulsives, reactionary as well as radical; and that those who think they can escape them are merely deceiving themselves by pursuing a path of thought that is socially fallacious. The radical is just as caught by such cultural compulsives as the reactionary."

It is not necessary to think very far into these assertions to realize that Calverton's "law" of the subjectivity of "social thought" actually appeals to objective truth for proof of its correctness. In this respect it suffers from the same disease that undermines all

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

subjective theories pretending to assert themselves as objective laws.

When Calverton tells us that we cannot escape the pressure of cultural compulsives, he automatically proclaims an objective social law which has all the force of an over-riding law of nature. He actually tells us that the only objective knowledge permitted by the pressure of class interests is the knowledge that we cannot know anything objectively in the social sciences. Obviously, such an assertion is really an appeal to one objective conclusion in order to prove the impossibility of all objective conclusions. It is an appeal to objective truth in order to prove its own impossibility and the unavoidability of subjectivism in "social thought."

Calverton himself demonstrates this for us by making a *direct appeal* to objectivity, shamefacedly sneaking it in at the back door after having confidently driven it out at the front. When he insists that failure to recognize the over-riding force of his "law of thought" is only self-deception and the "pursuit of a socially fallacious path of thought," everyone but Calverton will recognize this as a direct, though evasive, circumlocution for objective truth. Everyone will understand that Calverton wants to convince us that his "law" is objectively true and that it is incorrect not to recognize this fact.

Of course, the phrase "socially fallacious" might easily be construed in the spirit of Calverton's "myth" theory, according to which his "law" could be intrinsically untrue without being socially wrong. In that case, however, we would be compelled to conclude that though it may not really be true that "social thought" is subject to the pressure of class interests, as Calverton maintains, this untruth, for which he is seeking universal recognition, is still an over-riding objective law and socially everybody's thought is still subject to the pressure of class interests. However, even Calverton would hardly believe such nonsense, although it is the logical consequence of his own theory. On the other hand, if his theory is really untrue, then, for all scientific purposes, it is only so much verbal rubbish.

But suppose that Calverton's theory is really correct; suppose the class interest factor actually prevents an objective scientific analysis in the sphere of "social thought." In that case, it is impossible to accept it as an objective and scientifically valid law, for the simple reason that no interpretation of ideas can be objectively scientific, according to this law itself.

In other words, whether we admit that Calverton's subjective theory is true or untrue, in either case it merely succeeds in refuting itself. But even if we accept Calverton's own standard of measurement and judge his theory purely by its social effectiveness, irrespective of its truth or untruth, then on his own admission that the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

importance of cultural compulsives is little understood, his "explanation" is not only logically, but also socially, valueless. Certainly, a theory whose entire success consists in impotently refuting itself is hardly capable of serving the masses in a struggle in which logical and social *power* is the only guarantee of victory.

The absurdity of this whole performance, however, is so much greater in view of the fact that what he has achieved here is not a new explanation of the rise and fall of ideas, but simply a stupid error in elementary logic. Instead of discovering an over-riding law of thought, Calverton has merely over-ridden one of the simplest laws of correct thinking. His entire innovation consists in drawing *false* conclusions from correct premises, in correctly pointing out that knowledge does not exist outside of classes, but incorrectly concluding that this *automatically* renders objectivity impossible.

Such a conclusion is too simple and self-contradictory to be accepted as anything more than the ignorant although blatant confusion of a theorizing petty-bourgeois. It is a logical error whose real significance lies not in itself but in the class contents behind it; in the fact that Calverton starts with a Marxist, proletarian premise and ends up with the hypocritical, bourgeois conclusion that knowledge which is connected with classes is subjective and unscientific.

The truth is that Calverton's theory is not an *explanation* at all. It is only a fetishistic reflection of the socialogical illulsions of bourgeois society. The social relations between men in capitalist society are expressed in social categories which do not reveal but rather conceal the real character of these relations. These categories are not transparent and self-evident. As "fictions" created by society, they are not "natural" and eternal truths, but the expression of historically transitory relations. They constitute the surface appearances of bourgeois society, and no amount of classification and systematization of these categories as such will do more than express the ideas of capitalist society about itself. Instead of getting beneath these categories and appearances, which is the first condition for a scientific explanation, Calverton merely repeats them in the form of a self-annihilating theory. In doing this, he imagines that he has discovered the iron law of the rise and fall of ideas. But all that he has really discovered and failed to understand are the subjective ideas of decaying capitalism and the hopeless illusions of a petty-bourgeois intellectual.

This is demonstrated even more clearly when we pass from the self-refuting implications of Calverton's theory to its actual assertions regarding objectivity of the social sciences.

Take the contention that objectivity is possible only in the accumulation of facts but not in their interpretation. At first sight, this may appear to be a discriminating distinction resulting from a deep-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

going, scientific analysis. But in reality it is an extremely superficial and thoughtless notion taken bodily from the arsenal of the most pitiful and reactionary section of bourgeois apologists. It is simply a repetition of the argument of those who clamor for "facts" and deny the need of all theory. Obviously, its sole essence is the undeniable truth that it is easier to accept the fact of capitalist slavery when thinking is omitted entirely.

Social facts, however, are not just simple, easily observable units. In most instances they are complicated actions, movements and relations taking place under equally complicated conditions. Often, these must first be determined before the facts as such can even be ascertained. But without a scientific, materialist interpretation, it is impossible to be objective even in the mere establishment of these facts.

The double meaning and conventional lies of language, the discrepancy between word and deed, between appearance and reality, likewise contribute their share in concealing the real facts in capitalist society. Those undifferentiated facts that are easily accessible are often either scientifically insignificant and irrelevant, or they are merely the formal appearances of social phenomena.

It is precisely because "facts" do not grow like apples on low-hanging trees for every one, even a subjective sociologist, to pick, but are buried deep in the soil of capitalist appearances, that the hard, critical and objective work of scientific interpretation is needed. However, even where interpretation is unnecessary to establish the facts, there is no sharp dividing line between their collection and their interpretation.

Facts must be selected for their relevancy; they must be differentiated and not merely accepted at their face value. This requires interpretation, not merely of the established facts but to establish what the objective facts really are. No one can say exactly where the one ends and the other begins. In both instances, the individual observer either applies a conscious theory of the relevant importance, position and primacy of phenomena in a given set of relationships, or he applies an unconscious, eclectic theory consisting of acquired prejudices, illusions and perhaps even partial truths which guarantee that even the facts will not be reported objectively. But at no time do the class interests or the theory in which these are expressed suspend operation either during the collection of facts or during their interpretation. The process is continuous.

To the ordinary brain this conclusion would seem to proceed even from Calverton's own theory of the permanent pressure of cultural compulsives. But it seems as if in Calverton's brain, where the train of thought invariably ends up in direct opposition to its logical destination, things do not happen in the ordinary

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

way. It is therefore not surprising that the pressure of class interests is suddenly and "impartially" suspended for all classes during the first stage in the rise of ideas, namely, the interval of the accumulation of facts.

On the other hand, if the pressure of class interests is operative both in the collection and interpretation of facts, why should this same pressure, which is the sole cause militating against objectivity in the one instance, allow objectivity in the other? If interpretation is often necessary to be objective in the mere establishment of complicated facts, why should the extension of this interpretation to the established facts make objectivity entirely impossible? But it is no doubt unfair to ask for logical consistency from a theory whose highest achievement is the fact that it is invariably different from itself.

In reality, Calverton's compulsives also suspend operation in the interpretation as well as in the collection of facts—and the bourgeois lie of the "impartiality" of virgin fact and scientific interpretation reigns supreme. Calverton, of course, denies even the possibility of scientific interpretation. But this very denial, proceeding from the contention that a class point of view precludes objectivity, is actually an assertion that it is necessary to stand above the class struggle in order to be scientific. It is the negative expression of the bourgeois illusion of the social impartiality of science. Its real essence is the most slavish partiality for the bourgeoisie against the proletariat.

Do not the bourgeois scientists say they are objective because they stand impartially above all classes? They deny that Marxism is objective because it openly acknowledges its class allegiance. But to the bourgeois mind, "class objectivism" is a contradiction in terms not because these terms are really logically irreconcilable, but because sociologically the recognition of "class objectivism" would constitute a theoretical endorsement of the proletarian class struggle. The bourgeoisie, however, seeks to cover up its own class rule while preventing the workers from conducting a conscious struggle against this rule. And Calverton, in denying the possibility of class objectivism, actually raises this aim to a theory to be propagated within the ranks of the workers in the name of the workers.

No one, for example, will accuse President Hoover of representing the interests of all the people, including workers and bankers. And yet Hoover also says he is strictly impartial. He also pretends that knowledge must be free from class partisanship to be objective. He did not even blush when he signed a letter to the New York *Times* on September 17, in which he solemnly announced that "our government is and must be responsive to the will of the people expressed through considered public opinion," that is, through

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the press which has the great responsibility to see "that the news shall be accurately presented without bias or color that the public may have an opportunity of formulating its views on the actual facts."

No one, to take another example, will accuse the American Legion of being anything less than a fascist organization. In fact, Hoover has just called upon it for help in preventing the masses from taking "Calverton's" revolutionary way out of capitalist starvation. Nevertheless, in the preamble to its constitution, this same Legion also undertakes "to combat the autocracy of both the classes and the masses; to make right the master of might." It also is passionately impartial.

In other words, the cry of impartiality, the cry against class bias and the demand for uncolored facts is not merely the academic slogan of disinterested scientists. It is the hypocritical demagogy of the exploiters, the extortioners, the wage-cutters—the same fascist bourgeoisie that is attempting to enforce a regime of blood and hunger upon the American and colonial masses. It is a bourgeois lie which is not merely confined to the sphere of science and theory but is reflected in this sphere from the realm of economics and politics.

It is exactly the illusion of impartiality that has always proved to be the most costly in the history of the working class. It has accumulated sufficient evidence of how much the impartiality of words really conceals the partiality of material deeds. Every Communist knows and understands this.

It is precisely the development of the consciousness of this fact, the disillusioning of the masses as to the impartiality of their enemies that is the first condition for convincing them that the revolutionary way is the only way out of the living grave of capitalism. Every Communist knows this, too.

But Calverton, the ardent, unrelenting "Communist," Calverton, the unswerving, fanatical champion of the proletarian revolution, Calverton does not know anything about this. From his clamor one might expect to find him in the forefront of the battle. But rest assured! All the noise is coming from "impartial" heights far above the conflict. There he stands with all the serious self-respect of a comic opera general, bellowing down to the combatants below: "You are both equally subjective."

In terms of the real class struggle, of that very "living culture" which Calverton admits is alone decisive in shaping the lives of the masses, his "impartiality" is of the same fascist calibre as the "impartiality" of Hoover and the American Legion.

To prove this, we do not have to confine ourselves to political expressions of Calverton's "theory." His own "over-riding law

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of social thought" supplies sufficient evidence. This law actually asserts that man's ability to arrive at objective knowledge is in inverse proportion to its purposefulness. Inasmuch as Calverton contends that interpretation and purpose are inseparable and that purpose renders objectivity impossible, we can only conclude that the more a person follows a conscious end, the less objective is his knowledge.

Applied to whole social systems, this means that a planned Soviet economy, in which purpose is socially organized, is less capable of arriving at objective knowledge than anarchic capitalist society which operates without a central, organized purpose. It means that the victorious proletariat is more subjective than the decaying bourgeoisie. How such an inversion can help the proletariat to conduct a revolutionary struggle against the bourgeoisie is a mystery which not even Calverton is able to solve. Truly, "words are grown so false, a person is loath to prove reason with them."

The illusion of impartiality is a result of the division of labor in capitalist society, which has led to the isolation and specialization of the various forms of social activity. This division has produced a special group of people who are mostly unconnected with the material process of production. They themselves produce nothing but ideas. It is this exclusive preoccupation with words and ideas, coupled with the fact that the individual reacts to the external world only with the help of the brain, which produces the illusion of the independence and primacy of men's thought. The individual scientist, not to speak of the bourgeois apologist, therefore, imagines that his science is impartial only because he does not understand the connection between his activity as a scientist and the social conditions under which this activity occurs.

No scientific socialist denies the necessity of being impartial; but it must be impartiality towards the facts and not towards the class which it serves. Marxism also requires impartiality, but the truly scientific, unflinching impartiality which measures our subjective wishes and notions by the objective facts, so that we may follow a scientific, objectively feasable, yes, "socially correct" path in the achievement of our class aims. There is no intrinsic clash between science and class purpose. The clash arises when the aims and interests of a class go counter to the objective facts, and in that case, class objectivism, or science in the service of a class, is rejected for class subjectivism, or illusions aimed to bolster up the rule of a class.

When Calverton speaks of class interests, he does not understand that it is not the class interests as such that ultimately determine objectivity or subjectivity in social thought. It is the relation of these interests to objective reality that decides this question. If class

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

interests do not coincide with the objective historical movement, they cannot survive the over-riding forward march of this movement.

Therefore, whether one's class point of view results in subjective or objective conclusions depends ultimately upon the historical character of these class interests. It depends on whether these interests can be served by objective analysis or subjective illusions.

The class interests of the proletariat require a correct analysis of reality, whether physical or social. The workers have everything to gain from an objective understanding of their conditions of existence, precisely because such an understanding is necessary in emancipating themselves from these conditions. Objective truth about the physical world is likewise of importance to them, because it increases the material prerequisites for a society without poverty and exploitation. At the same time, it helps to free them from intellectual bondage to the products of the human brain.

While this may have been true of the bourgeoisie at one time, it is certainly not true today. There was a time when bourgeois ideologists admitted the existence of classes and the class struggle, although they failed to understand their material basis. But even this changed quickly after the bourgeoisie became a ruling class itself. It changed because, instead of abolishing all classes, it merely replaced one form of exploitation by another. If today there are a great number of bourgeois ideologists who admit the existence of the class struggle and supply many elements of an objective social analysis, it is because capitalism is breaking up, because the impoverishment and expropriation of the lower strata of the population, including the petty bourgeoisie, is proceeding apace, and finally because these ideologists are in partial opposition to the decay of the bourgeoisie itself.

Even an objective analysis of physical reality adds to the number of contradictions which are rapidly shattering the capitalist system. And the tendency to place obstacles in the way of further scientific development is manifested in numerous ways. In this respect, the present crisis has revealed more sharply than ever the full reactionary force of decaying capitalism.

If this is true of the physical world, how much more so is it true of society? An objective analysis of social life means telling the truth about exploitation, about oppression, about poverty. It necessarily reveals the historically transitory character of the capitalist system as well as of the capitalists as a social class. It therefore involves a scientific acknowledgement of the historical necessity of their disappearance. Such an analysis would provide the working class with a scientific weapon against the capitalist

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

system. It would mature its revolutionary class consciousness and strengthen its revolutionary will. The bourgeoisie, therefore, cannot go beyond the point of view of class subjectivism without acknowledging its own dissolution. Obviously such an acknowledgement is hardly in harmony with the preservation of the capitalist system. It is hardly in harmony with the continuous reproduction of the conditions that make one man a capitalist and another a wage-slave and perhaps an unemployed one at that.

Calverton is incapable of understanding all this. He therefore cannot understand that there is class objectivism as well as class subjectivism, and that the recognition of the reality of both is much more true to life, much richer and much more fruitful as an explanation of the "rise and fall of ideas" than the dogma that no class is capable of objective interpretation.

He cannot understand this because he is satisfied with a mere superficial repetition of a general formula about the class character of knowledge. But the question of objectivity or subjectivity in the social sciences cannot be settled this way, which can only lead to the formulation of foolish dogmas. It is necessary to trace out and understand the actual connection between class interests and the formation of ideas. Calverton borrowed his general formula from the Marxist conception of history. But in doing this, he omitted its Marxist content. He failed to take over its full, many-sided and dialectic treatment of the question.

The first condition for objectivity in any science, and particularly in the social sciences is a materialist point of view. But what is a materialist criterion in the social sciences? Such a criterion must be outside of the sphere of ideas as such. It must be sought in the material conditions for the production of these ideas. This criterion is the criterion of production. But the same human race that produces its material requirements of life also produces the ideas that reflect and express its other activities. The concept of production, therefore, includes mental as well as material production. The fundamental problem of social science is to establish the inter-action between the two spheres of production. But this can only be done by holding fast to the primacy of material production. This means that science and knowledge are not independent entities; as forms of human activity, they are part of man's general production activity. In fact, scientific knowledge is directly and indirectly a force of material production.

The second condition of objectivity in the social sciences is an historical, developmental conception of production. Material production is the basic condition for the existence and development of all society. Human life is impossible without means of subsistance. No one has been able to live on the spiritual fruits of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his ideas alone; unless these fruits assume a material form, he is bound to perish. But the production of the means of subsistence depends upon the means and instruments of production. It is the development of these instruments of production on the one hand, and man's relation to these instruments on the other, that has constituted the material substance of human history. Man's history, therefore, is the history of his productive activities, the history of production expressed in terms of class interests and class struggles. The development of material production is thus the ultimate criterion of objectivity in the social sciences.

This historic, materialist conception was first uncovered and developed by Karl Marx. Fortunately, he has left us an illuminating passage, comparing Ricardo with Malthus, which deals exactly with this question. We shall therefore quote it at length.

> "Ricardo," Marx wrote, "is right for his time in viewing the capitalist method of production as the most advantageous for production in general, as the most advantageous for the production of wealth. He wants *production for the sake of production and in* this he is right. Should one wish to assert, as sentimental opponents of Ricardo have done, that production is not a goal in itself, then he would forget that production for production's sake only means the development of the human forces of production, *hence the development of the wealth of human nature as its own end.* Should one oppose, as Sismondi does, the welfare of the individual against this end, one would be asserting that the development of the species should be *retarded* in order to assure the welfare of the individual; hence, for example, that no war should be waged in which individuals are in any way destroyed. Sismondi is right only as against those economists who *conceal,* deny this antagonism.
>
> "It is not understood that this development of the capacities of the *human* species, although it takes place at first at the cost of the majority of human individuals and certain human classes, finally breaks through this antagonism and coincides with the development of the single individual; hence that the higher development of the personality is purchased only through an historical process in which individuals are sacrificed. . . .
>
> "Ricardo's relentlessness, therefore, was not only *scientifically honest,* but *scientifically required* for his standpoint. But this also rendered it immaterial to him whether the development of the productive forces kills off landed property or workers. If this progress depreciates the capital of the industrial bourgeoisie, this likewise is welcome to him. If the development of the productive force of labor depreciates the existing fixed capital by half, what about it, says Ricardo. The productivity of human labor has doubled. Here, therefore, is *scientific honesty.* If Ricardo's conception is on the whole in the interest of the *industrial bourgeoisie,* it is only *because* and so far as its interest coincides with that of production, or the productive development of human labor. Where it enters into opposition to it, he is just as relentless against the bourgeoisie as he is otherwise against the proletariat and the aristocracy."

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Production for production's sake, therefore, means the continuous development of the productive forces. The class whose interests coincide with this continued development can take the point of view of production for production's sake and hence can develop an objective attitude in the social sciences. At each stage of historical development some class represents the continuous development of the productive forces. The productive forces, however, not only outlive specific classes which exist only in certain historical periods; they not only continue long after these classes are gone, but they constitute the material conditions for the development of a classless society. Objective scientific knowledge, therefore, as a productive force, has a class basis, but is above classes —just as the proletariat itself is a class and yet is the class that stands for the achievement of the future classless society. It outlives any individual class, but it can do this only as it is carried forward in the process of the class struggle. In short, it is the continuity of production, of the historical movement that is objective and requires and enforces an objective method.

The subjective interests of the workers as a *class* cannot be served unless the working class is objective in its interpretation and is guided by the objective conditions in its class politics. The working class, therefore, is that class in which the subjective and objective merge and constitute a real historical synthesis and unity, precisely because it is the class which stands for the continuity of production and the free untrammled development of human labor. Without the objective conditions, the workers cannot achieve their aims, without the subjective force of the working class the objective conditions are historically pregnant but remain only a tragic potentiality. Furthermore, the working class, as the subjective factor, is itself part of the total situation at any time. It is the action of the working class within this situation, therefore, that is decisive for the development of the total objective situation. Failure to understand the relationship between the two, or any attempt to establish absolute, insurmountable barriers between them, as Calverton does, is a total failure to understand either the role of the working class in the historical process or the conditions of its revolutionary emancipation. Failure to make this clear to the workers is to desert and betray them at the most decisive and critical period of their history.

The question to be asked, therefore, at any concrete moment, is: Under what conditions can we acquire and apply an objective method? What is necessary for the development of that type of activity which will produce objective results and real scientific advance? In reality, this is not an academic question, but a problem of actual history. As a problem of human beings living under

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

definite historical conditions, it is a question of which social forces will further the development of science and which will hinder and retard it.

Does this mean that only a proletarian can be objective, that the bourgeoisie can never be objective in social science? We have seen from Marx's quotation that the founder of scientific socialism does not himself make such foolish assertions. Marx has the greatest respect for Ricardo's scientific honesty, though he recognizes his scientific limitations. Ricardo represents the interests of the bourgeoisie, nevertheless he was an objective scientist because he maintained the point of view of production for production's sake.

No one is born with an objective, scientific outlook. It takes a difficult process of learning to become an objective thinker. A backward worker may be filled with the worst superstitions, prejudices and illusions. The fact that he is a worker does not in itself safeguard him against these things.

It is only as he becomes class-conscious and acquires the scientific achievements of the revolutionary working class *movement* that he is able to be objective in the study of society. In a word, it is not his individual position, but his class position that makes it possible for him to be objective in the social sciences.

Similarly, it is not the individual bourgeois, but the position of the bourgeoisie as a class which, at a certain stage, interferes with the development of an objective outlook. It is only as this class barrier is overstepped that the individual bourgeois is free to become objective. It is only as the proletarian is ready to become revolutionary and hence to destroy all class barriers that he can become objective. But he can do this, not by ceasing to be a proletarian, but in his capacity as a member of the revolutionary proletariat. It is not necessary to wait for the abolition of classes to become objective. It is the class that stands for the abolition of classes that is in a position to develop social objectivity. Objectivity or subjectivity is established in the actual class struggle taking place now, for, as a real question, it is a question of the struggle of the forces of progess against the forces of reaction.

The whole question, therefore, is an historical question. During the period when the interests of the bourgeoisie coincide with the development of production, it may be objective. As long as the proletarian class struggle is undeveloped, the bourgeoisie can contribute toward the development of objective social science. But it becomes entirely incapable of objectivity the moment the further development of production requires its destruction as a ruling class. Decaying capitalism cannot maintain the criterion of production for production's sake.

In addition to the critical and "oppositional" position of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

exploited class, a ruling class may develop partial opposition among the ideologists in its own ranks. These also supply valuable objective material. Furthermore, the truth will often out when the thieves fall out. The Southern slaveholders, for example, shed bitter tears in exposing the exploitation of the free proletariat by the northern capitalists. And the northern capitalists did the same for southern slavery. All in all, therefore, the whole question is too complicated to be settled by an unapplied formula.

In fact, to formulate the question of objectivism and subjectivism as Calverton does, is not only to contradict the actual achievements of Marxism, but is really to reflect the impotence of bourgeois social "science."

No one in his proper sense would undertake to question the possibilities of objective knowledge in the sphere of the natural sciences. The achievements of natural science are too patent; its accomplishments are recorded in too many material products to be successfully doubted by anyone but an ignoramus or a lunatic.

But if people are capable of objective knowledge in one sphere of investigation, why should they be incapable of it in another sphere? It is true that not all sciences are equally developed. But the fact that a certain study has not arrived at the quantitative or mathematical stage is no argument against the possibility of being objective in this study. In fact, bourgeois economics has developed very far along quantitative lines, yet this has not prevented it from suffering complete bankruptcy. The real reason for doubting the possibility of objective social science is the total failure of bourgeois social science to make any real progress, in spite of its advanced mathematical methods. Inasmuch as the bourgeois intellectuals and ideologists do not generally recognize the achievements of Marxism, it is only logical for them to conclude from the bankruptcy of bourgeois social science, that all social science is really impossible. The present crisis has brought the utter impotence of this science sharply to the forefront and has consequently magnified this doubt.

It is this that Calverton reflects rather than any deep-going, logical analysis of the relation between social science and social classes. His talk about the impossibility of the quantitative study of social phenomena and hence the impossibility of objective social science is just plain ignorance.

Statistical analysis and forecasting has been the highest "achievement" of bourgeois economic theory. In the last ten years, it was precisely this quantitative side of bourgeois economics which was most highly developed. Nevertheless, all the detailed statistical analyses of the business cycle have not prevented the deepest and certainly

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the most far-reaching economic crisis in the history of capitalist society.

In fact, the crisis has shattered all of the "scientific" predictions about the end of crises. Nothing has displayed the impotence of bourgeois social science so distinctly and so pitifully. Here we see, therefore, not that quantitative methods are inapplicable to social science, but that even where they are highly developed, unless they are based on a scientific theory, they necessarily deal only with the surface phenomena of the capitalist economic system. What this shows is not the bankruptcy of statistics, but the bankruptcy of the assumptions of the eternity of capitalism underlying the application of these statistics.

Prior to the present crisis, all the financial quacks and economic doctors were confident of the permanence and the unshakable stability of the capitalist system. The Marxist analysis of the Communist International was of course ignored or ridiculed. When the crisis finally came, the "new era" economics burst like an inflated balloon. All of its notions were turned inside out in a single sweep.

The crisis has displayed such an intensity and depth, it has manifested so many unfamiliar features, that it has worked havoc on their confident ignorance of the forces operating in society today. The events of the next day disproved the prophecies of the day before. So far all the king's horses and all the king's men have been unable to put humpty-dumpty together again.

As a result, confusion reigns supreme. All of them are looking for a new economic messiah to lead them out of the wilderness. Col. Ayres, economist of the Cleveland Tust Company, has already turned back two hundred years in search of help. "Serious" financial authorities have advanced different "solutions." But the best they have all been able to do so far is to counsel faith. Most of them are convinced that just as capitalism "grew up" to its enlarged production facilities and its overproduction in the past, so it would continue to do in the future. All of them fall back on the pious assumption that *after* the crisis, a new era of capitalism will develop again.

But the simple truth is that official bourgeois science has entered a reactionary impasse, radiating pessimism at a time when turbulent events are constantly confirming the scientific correctness of Marxism. The crisis has sharpened the entire question of social science into a more visibly categoric "either-or"—either Marxism or scientific bankruptcy. This was actually admitted in a recent lecture by the Marquis of Lothian delivered before the London School of Economics and Political Science. "I confess," he said, "that the prophecies of Marx and Lenin about the inevitable development of modern Western society are being realized with the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

most uncomfortable accuracy." (Reported in the New York *Times*, July 26, 1931.)

To come forward with a subjective "theory" at a time when the correctness of the Communist analysis is being proved not only in the realm of theory but in the very life and experience of whole masses of people all over the world—is not Communism but just plain reactionary bourgeois decadence.

After all that has been said about Calverton's relentless subjectivism, it may be strange to hear that he believes objectivity is both possible and necessary. But truth is often stranger than fiction, especially in the case of a "theory" which so unhesitatingly reveals itself in all its opposites. In the latest issue of his *Modern Quarterly*, he actually announces objective science and Marxism as the real hope of mankind. On the other hand, his theory of cultural compulsives, which proclaims the hegemony of subjectivism in the social sciences, was probably written at the same time that Calverton wrote his article in the *Modern Quarterly*. In any case, this theory was not advanced in opposition to his views expressed in the *Quarterly*. But to make confusion worse confounded, Calverton is frightened at his own boldness and before he brings his theory of compulsives to a happy and subjective close, he makes a sharp turn and consciously attempts to make room, even if it is only a hidden corner, for objective truth. However, in order to conceal this obvious self-contradiction, Calverton declares that not he is in a dilemma, but that his dilemma is an objective law of "social thought"!

If the pressure of class interests prevents one from being objective, the only way to achieve objectivity, therefore, is to remove this pressure. Cultural compulsives, however, can only be destroyed by eliminating the class interests and hence the classes that create them. "But since these interests will be with us until we organize a new kind of society, in which they can no longer function, and since we are all affected by those interests, however objective we may try to be, the task that confronts us," Calverton concludes, "is not to deny the presence of such cultural compulsives, but to *attempt to keep them from blinding us to facts that are of importance to our intellectual heritage.*" (Emphasis ours.)

Thus, under cover of the phrase, "blinding us to the facts," Calverton once more attempts to sneak in the conception of objective *truth*. For, if recognition of Calverton's "law" will enable us to open our eyes to the facts, then how can we help but arrive at the objective truth of these facts?

Furthermore, the above quotation should be sufficient proof that we have not simply wished the role of "impartial bourgeois"

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

upon Calverton. Calverton who insists that every social theory represents, serves and arises out of the interest of some class; who professes to be a Communist representing the interests of the working class, suddenly forgets his public professions and just as publicly deserts the class point of view of the proletariat.

For example. How can a Marxist talk about "our cultural heritage" without indicating the class contents of this heritage or specifying the class that is to receive this heritage? But even from Calverton's own, non-Marxist, point of view, this is just the opposite of what his theory professes to assert.

In addition, he advises both classes to recognize his "law" in order to keep from blinding themselves. But to what facts, for what interest and to which end should this be done? Perhaps the proletariat should not blind itself to the merits of the bourgeoisie and the bourgeoisie to the merits of the proletariat? Calverton, apparently, considers his task to be to call on the masses to take the revolutionary way out of the bourgeois system, but at the same time to call upon the bourgeoisie to open its eyes to the impending revolution—and of course to prevent the revolutionary action of the masses! If this is not plain betrayal and a brazen surrender of the proletarian class *struggle*, we should like to know what is!

In fact, according to Calverton's dilemma, Marxism is really unnecessary in rallying the masses for the proletarian revolution. If a scientific sociology and politics is possible only *after* the destruction of capitalism, then Marxism could become a scientific theory of the strategy and tactics of proletarian revolution only *after* this revolution had been accomplished. Meanwhile it is a stimulating "myth" or fiction, like a bundle of hay, to dangle before the proletarian jackass in order to urge him on to achieve the desired revolutionary goal.

In practice, however, this is a total surrender of independent, revolutionary *thinking* and its replacement by an impotent, counter-revolutionary nonsense. For, unless Marxism is developed as an objective science, it must degenerate into a mere uncritical acceptance of "common sense" scraps, unsystematized experiences, subjective notions and crippled conceptions all absorbed from the bourgeois environment and the bourgeois schools of thought. As such, it would be worse than useless; it would be positively disastrous.

This, however, is not merely a negative surrender of Marxism, but a positive concession to the illusions of the decaying bourgeoisie. It is a projection of its class position into the realm of theory and thereby into the ranks of the proletariat. It is a total obliteration of class differences under the pretence of maintaining the point of view of different class interests.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But suppose we acknowledge the presence of Calverton's compulsives. Can our knowledge of them help us to overcome them? Can this knowledge, which is certainly objective, help us to conquer our otherwise helpless subjectivism? It is characteristic of all our other knowledge that it helps us to control the phenomena which we can understand. But what about Calverton's "law" of the rise and fall of ideas?

Calverton also senses this problem and attempts to overcome it in his previous manner of secretly calling objectivity to the rescue.

> "By being aware of the presence of cultural compulsives," he says, "we are not able to free ourselves from them—to do that would be to say that the individual mind is greater than the social mind from which it has originated and by which it is controlled—but we are better able to protect ourselves from the more absurd, because too uncritical extremes to which such compulsives may drive us. Those of us who are radical cannot expect to view society from an objective point of view—our very objective makes such objectivity impossible. Nor for the same reason, can those who are middle class view society with any more objectivity.... At the same time, however, the radical can be on his guard against accepting Morgan, or any future Morgan, unquestioningly simply because he has become part of his cultural compulsive, and the middle class sociologist can be on his guard against accepting Westermarck, or any future Westermarck, because he has become part of his cultural compulsive. In other words, the awareness of the compulsive nature of social thought should make it possible for the development of a little more flexibility and a little more criticism within the radius of the cultural compulsive itself."

These remarks which conclude Calverton's exposition of his "theory" are at the same time the final and most open admission of its bankruptcy. In the first place, if radical and bourgeois can be on their guard against accepting theories which have become part of their cultural compulsives, then, in plain English, they can be objective and arrive at a "socially correct" and objective interpretation of these theories. Secondly, if by being aware of our cultural compulsives, we can protect ourselves from absurd extremes, then, in terms of the class struggle, the working class should be able to be less partisan, less the slave of its consistent class interests and more generous and compromising, like Calverton himself, who, because he understands all, forgives all. In the third place, if objectivity is impossible anyway, then the argument of a little more flexibility and a little more criticism can mean only one of two things: Either it leads to complete objectivity, or it merely weakens the original subjectivity without changing its fundamental character.

In other words, all this is merely the inextricable, pious and impotent confusion of a petty-bourgeois philistine bewildered by the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

social forces which are persuading him that it is best to sweep his own doorstep and avoid the revolutionary dangers of unknown—and lord knows, unknowable—extremes. It is the unmistakable expression of that same philistine whom the great German poet Goethe defined as an empty bladder full only of fears and trepidations.

In plain English, again, Calverton's call for a little more flexibility is merely another way of stating that his conclusions contradict and nullify every one of his original assertions and that nonsensical verbiage is better than an open but uncomfortable admission that he knows that objectivity is not only necessary for the proletariat but actually possible.

Calverton's theory has thus transformed the whole question of objectivity into a petty-bourgeois illusion, demonstrating that the denial of objectivity leads to a total surrender of the workers' class interests.

Here again, we need only refer to real, living situations to gauge the true character of Calverton's apparently theoretical conclusion. When, for example, the Spanish Minister of the Interior, Miguel Maura, recently declared that "it is the government's intention to deal harshly with the extremists" and to smash the revolutionary movement, he merely translated into the harsh terms of the living class struggle what Calverton so piously proposed in his theory of cultural compulsives. Calverton, the avowed "Communist," will of course deny the social-fascist character of his talk about extremes. But in society, where the fate of the entire population is determined by the class struggle, where individual actions and ideas count socially only as they are part of this struggle, the subjective claims and intentions of a single person mean nothing except to himself. Certainly Calverton who pretends to have discovered the inexorable force of *class* interests can hardly point to his good intentions and claim immunity because of his ignorance of social forces!

The phrase "cultural compulsives" thus proves to be an undigested truth combined with a direct denial of this truth. Instead of advancing an objective law of "social thought," Calverton, therefore, merely advances a series of impotent contradictions. In spite of his disdainful dismissal of the Hegelian dialectic, he stands before us like a house divided against itself, not a real house, however, but merely a house of cards collapsing in the wind. His assertions appear simple, impartial and complete in themselves, but, without his intention, they arise, step out of themselves and summersault into their direct opposites, a testimony to how flat and uninvited the contradictions of a petty-bourgeois eclectic can actually be. Calverton's plight reminds one of the person who discov-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ered that a beehive is a bee-holder, a beholder a spectator and a specked 'tater a bad vegetable.—Both come to a bad end!

While Calverton suffers from the illusion that he represents the revolutionary ideology of the proletariat, the bourgeoisie itself has no such illusions about him. It is a very significant indication of Calverton's real character that the imperialist government of Japan has officially invited him, as second in popularity in Japan only to Upton Sinclair, to lecture at the University of Tokyo, Wasedo University and Kyoto University. Marxism has great prestige among Japanese students. The government has done its utmost to combat and root it out. Real Marxists, revolutionary workers and students have been jailed and killed; their homes have been raided and their meetings smashed in a reign of bloody terror. The latest reports from Japan indicate a wave of repression against the working class unequalled since the mass arrests in April, 1929. On August 26, over 1,000 revolutionary workers were arrested in Osaka, Kobe and Kyoto. Among those arrested are the most active leaders of the revolutionary trade unions. Even leaders of the centrist unions have been arrested. Two hundred and sixty persons were arrested in Kyoto, and arrests are still being made in Kobe. In Tokyo mass arrests began on September 15 and are still continuing.

Calverton, the ardent revolutionist, the self-styled "cultural Communist," whose function is really to "take Communism away from the Communists," to discredit the Communist Party as the theoretician and ideological leader of the proletarian revolution, to replace actual revolutionary Marxism by pseudo-Marxism, has accepted the invitation to help the government in its murderous task!

As a Marxist, Mr. Calverton, you are bankrupt and no gesture of yours can hide it. We merely recommend that you close up shop! As a social-fascist ideologist, however, you will find an open market in any part of the capitalist world. We are quite sure you will make the most of it.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, CIRCULATION, ETC., REQUIRED BY THE ACT OF CONGRESS OF AUGUST 24, 1912, OF THE COMMUNIST, published monthly at New York, N. Y., for October 1, 1931.

State of New York
County of New York

Before me, a Notary Public in and for the State and county aforesaid, personally appeared W. E. Douglas, who, having been duly sworn, deposes and says that he is the Business Manager of The Communist, and that the following is, to the best of his knowledge and belief, a true statement of the ownership, management (and if a daily paper, the circulation), etc., of the aforesaid publication for the date shown in the above caption, required by the Act of August 24, 1912, embodied in section 411, Postal Laws and Regulations, printed on the reverse of this form, to wit:

1. That the names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor, and business managers are:

Publisher, Communist Party of U. S. A., 50 East 13th Street, New York City.

Editors, Earl Browder, William Z. Foster and William W. Weinstone, 50 East 13th Street, New York City.

Managing Editor, None.

Business Manager, W. E. Douglas, 50 East 13th Street, New York City.

2. That the owner is: (If owned by a corporation, its name and address must be stated and also immediately thereunder the names and addresses of stockholders owning or holding one per cent or more of total amount of stock. If not owned by a corporation, the names and addresses of the individual owners must be given. If owned by a firm, company, or other unincorporated concern, its name and address, as well as those of each individual member, must be given.)

Communist Party of U. S. A., 50 East 13th Street, New York City.

Earl Browder, William Z. Foster and William W. Weinstone, Secretariat, 50 East 13th Street, New York City.

A non-profit organization—political.

3. That the known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 per cent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: (If there are none, so state.)

None.

4. That the two paragraphs next above, giving the names of its owners, stockholders and security holders as they appear upon the books of the company but also, in cases when the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting, is given; also that the said two paragraphs contain statements embracing affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than any other person, association, or corporation has any interest direct or indirect in the said stock, bonds, or other securities than as so stated by him.

5. That the average number of copies of each issue of this publication sold or distributed through the mails or otherwise, to paid subscribers during the six months preceding the date shown above is (This information is required from daily publications only.)

W. E. DOUGLAS, Business Manager.

(Seal)

Sworn and subscribed before me this 5th Day of October 1931.

FAY SIEGARTEL, Notary Public.

(My Commission expires March 30, 1933.)

SOUTH SIDE WORKERS
BOOK STORE
55[illegible] E. 63rd [illegible]

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Combination Subscription Offers

THE COMMUNIST

REGULAR SUBSCRIPTION $2 PER YEAR. TOGETHER WITH

Daily Worker—$6 per year ..... Both for $7.00
International Press Correspondence (Inprecor) $6 per year ..... Both for $7.00
Communist International—$2 per year ..... Both for $3.50
R. I. L. U. Magazine—$2 per year ..... Both for $3.50
Labor Unity—$1.50 per year ..... Both for $3.00
Labor Defender—$1 per year ..... Both for $2.50
New Masses—$1.50 per year ..... Both for $3.00
Workers Theatre—$1.50 per year ..... Both for $3.00

Add $1.00 for foreign postage and $1.50 for Canadian postage for combination subscriptions outside the United States.

Send subscriptions to

THE COMMUNIST
P. O. BOX 148, STATION D NEW YORK CITY

Now in the 6th year —
the 21st since the Old Masses

NEW MASSES

Today the only monthly magazine of workers' art and literature—and chief spokesman for the growing workers cultural movement in America.

27 young American artists are regular contributors to *New Masses.*

Outstanding young revolutionary writers, poets and critics made their first appearance, and still appear in *New Masses.*

Every month: SHORT STORIES, ARTICLES, POEMS, REVIEWS, THEATRE, MOVIES, and a bird's-eye view of a growing American workers culture in a section on WORKERS ART.

Now on sale at Workers' Bookshops and newsstands—15 cents

SUBSCRIPTION $1.50 PER YEAR

NEW MASSES—63 West 15th Street, New Y

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Build the

Daily Worker

Deepen the roots of the Party in the shops, mines and factories.

Each new sub taken in a shop or factory is an additional stronghold in a fortress of Communism.

The *Daily Worker* is our greatest ally in the vital work of organizing shop nuclei.

The *Daily Worker* assumes not only the role of mass propagandist, but also mass organizer. Every contact established thru subscriptions to the Daily becomes a center of activity.

Every new Daily Worker Club is a pioneering movement entering new working class and agrarian neighborhoods.

Expose the lies of the capitalist press by spreading the *Daily Worker*. The *Daily Worker* tells the truth about the present crisis, unemployment, starvation, evictions, lay-offs, wage cuts, about imperialist war, Soviet Russia.

SUBSCRIBE TO THE DAILY WORKER

Subscription rates $6.00 per year, in Manhattan and Bronx area $8.00 per year

SUBSCRIBE TO THE COMMUNIST

Subscription rates—$2.00 per year

Combination Offer

The Communist	$2.00
The Daily Worker	6.00
Total	$8.00

Both for $7.00 per year

The Communist	$2.00
The Daily Worker in N. Y. C.	8.00
Total	$10.00

Both for $8.00 per year

Send subscriptions to

The DAILY WORKER

50 East 13th Street New York City

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED